



*Library of the Theological Seminary,*  
PRINCETON, N. J.

Presented by Dr. D. Sc. Parton.

BR 755 .S76 1882 v.5  
Stoughton, John, 1807-1897.  
History of religion in  
England from the opening of

19.5





HISTORY OF

RELIGION IN ENGLAND,

*FROM THE OPENING OF THE  
LONG PARLIAMENT TO THE END OF THE  
EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.*

✓ BY  
JOHN STOUGHTON, D.D.

VOLUME V.  
THE CHURCH OF THE REVOLUTION.

*NEW AND REVISED EDITION.*

New York:  
A. C. ARMSTRONG AND SON,  
714, BROADWAY.

MDCCLXXXII.





## CONTENTS OF VOL. V.

---

### CHAPTER I.

Prince of Orange, 1.—Marriage, 5.—Burnet's Visit to the Hague, 8.—Crisis in England, 9.—Invitation to the Prince of Orange, 11.—Conduct of James, 14.—Sancroft's Proceedings, 16.—Interviews between James and the Bishops, 18.—Declaration from the Prince of Orange, 21.—Bishops in the Royal Closet, 24.—William's Departure from Holland, 28.—Arrival in England, 30.—His Progress, 32.—Service in Exeter Cathedral, 33.—Reception given to William, 35.—Disaffection to James, 38.—William at Salisbury, 41.—Flight of James, 45.—The Prince of Orange in London, 49.—Clergy and Dissenting Ministers wait on him, 51.

### CHAPTER II.

England in the midst of Revolution, 54.—Different Policies, 56.—Convention, 61.—William's Decision, 65.—Settlement and Appointment of Ministers of State, 68.—Different Opinions, 71.

### CHAPTER III.

Oath of Allegiance, 73.—Efforts in Favour of Nonconformists, 76.—Coronation Oath and Coronation, 79.—Comprehension, 82.—How regarded by Dissenters, 88.—Measures for “easing,” or indulging Nonconformists, 90.—Doctrine of Toleration, 92.—The New Act, 95.—Commission in Reference to allowing Church Services, 98.—Convocation, 107.—Discussion, 109.

### CHAPTER IV.

The Landing of James in Ireland, 112.—Bishops and others who refused to take the New Oath, 113.—New Parliament, 120.—

Battle of the Boyne, 122.—Treatment of Nonjurors afterwards, 127.—Deaths of distinguished Nonconformists—Bunyan, 130.—Collinges, 131.—Flavel, 132.—Baxter, 133.—Holcroft, 136.

## CHAPTER V.

Tillotson succeeds Sancroft, 140.—Sancroft in Retirement, 142.—Death of Tillotson, 145.—Tenison the New Archbishop, 148.—Death of Queen Mary, 149.—Silent Changes, 151.—Injunctions issued on Tenison's Accession to the Archiepiscopate, 152.—Tenison nominated First of the Lord Justices during William's Absence, 154.—Controversy respecting the Trinity, 157.—Wallis, 159.—Sherlock and Bingham, 160.—South, 161.—Howe, 163.—Act in Support of Orthodox Opinions, 167.

## CHAPTER VI.

Declaration issued by James, and Sympathizers in England, 168.—Execution of Jacobites, 170, 174.—Peace of Ryswick, 176.—New Parliament, 177.—Nomination of Bishops, 179.—Death of Duke of Gloucester, 180.—Act of Settlement, 182.—Death of James II., 183.—New Form of Abjuration, 186.

## CHAPTER VII.

Letter to a Convocation Man, 189.—Wake and Atterbury, 191.—Synods and Convocation, 195.—Meeting of the Latter, 197.—Toland's Book, 200.—Burnet's Book, 202.—Collision between the Two Houses, 203.—Question as to *Premunientes* Clause, 208.—Dispute as to Power of Prorogation, 211.—Death of William, 214.

## CHAPTER VIII.

Theological Opinions of Bishops in the Reign of William III., 217.—Their Politics, 224.—Case of Watson, Bishop of St. David's, 225.—Distinguished Clergymen—Beveridge, 226.—Bull, Norris, and Burkett, 227.—Horneck, 228.—Ecclesiastical Discipline, 228.—Psalmody, 231.—Character and Circumstances of the Clergy, 232.—State of Society, 237.

## CHAPTER IX.

The Boyle Lecture, 242.—Locke's "Reasonableness of Christianity," 244.—"Essay on the Understanding," 245.—Blount and Toland, 246.—Norris' "Account of Reason and Faith," 247.—Style of Theological Literature, 248.

## CHAPTER X.

Religious Societies—Young Men's Associations, 252.—Society for Checking Immorality, 253.—Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 257.—Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, 259.

## CHAPTER XI.

Personal History of Nonjurors—Kettlewell, 263.—Dodwell, 265.—Hicks, 267.—Nelson, 268.—Ken, 273.—White, 274.—Political Views of Nonjurors, 275.—Modes of Worship, 277.—Decline of the Party, *ib.*—Death of Ken, *ib.*

## CHAPTER XII.

Consolidation of Dissent, 279.—Meeting Houses, 280.—Presbyterian Ordinations, 283.—Early Life of Dr. Calamy, 284.—Choice of Ministers, 288.—Academies, 289.—"Heads of Agreement" between Presbyterians and Independents, 293.—Associations, 294.—Controversy respecting Calvinistic Doctrines, 295.—Controversy about Occasional Conformity, 300.—Nonconformist Home Life, 305.

## CHAPTER XIII.

Death of Philip Henry, 307.—Annesley, 308.—Vincent and Bates, 309.—Howe, 310.—Passing away of the Old Puritans, 313.—Baptists after the Revolution, 314.—Kiffin and Keach, 316.—Particular and General Baptists, 317.—Quakers, 318.

## CHAPTER XIV.

Queen Anne's Accession, 321.—Character of the Queen, 322.—The Royal Touch, 324.—The Coronation, 324.—The Queen at Oxford, and at St. Paul's, 326.—High and Low Church, 328.—Occasional Conformity Bill, 331.—Convocation, 335.—Parliament, 338.—Convocation, 340.—Atterbury and Wake, 341.

## CHAPTER XV.

Storm in England, 343.—The Conformity Bill again, 345.—Daniel De Foe's Satire, 346.—De Foe in the Pillory, 349.—Queen Anne's Bounty, 349.—Church not in Danger, 352.—Convocation, *ib.*—Union of England and Scotland, 355.—Death of Prince George, 358.—French Protestants, 360.

## CHAPTER XVI.

Henry Sacheverell, 362.—Act against Occasional Conformity, 367.—The Schism Bill, 369.—Convocation, 371.—Atterbury's "Representation," 372.—Death of Queen Anne, 375.

## CHAPTER XVII.

Character of the Clergy, 377.—Orator Henley, 380.—Ecclesiastical Buildings, 382.—The Universities, 384.—Church Life at Court, 388.—In the City, 389.—In the Provinces, 392.—Clerical Incomes, 393.

## CHAPTER XVIII.

Thomas Bradbury, 397.—Accession of George I., 399.—Rebellion, 401.—Deaths of Burnet and Tenison, 404.—Wake and the Gallican Church, 405.—George I. and the Dissenters, 409.—Repeal of Occasional Conformity and Schism Acts, 410.—Convocation, 412.—The Bangorian Controversy, 413.—Salters' Hall Meeting, 417.—Dr. Calamy, 420.—Arrest and Banishment of Atterbury, 422.—Changes in the Episcopate, 425.—Preachers, 426.—Deistical Controversy, 427.—Other Controversies, 430.

## CHAPTER XIX.

Nonconformist Ministers — Daniel Burgess, 433.—Stennet, Matthew Henry, Dr. Williams, Dr. Gale, Pomfret, Rosewell, and Dr. Calamy, 434.—Dr. Watts, 437.—Simon Browne and Jeremiah Jones, 441.—Nonconformist Preaching, 442.—Places of Worship, 444.—Nonconformist Gentry, 448.—The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, 449.—Choice of Ministers, 450.—Academies, 451.—Baptists, 453.—Home Life, 454.—Census, 457.—General State of Dissent, 458.

## CHAPTER I.

WILLIAM HENRY, Prince of Orange, was a member of the House of Nassau, the antiquity of which is traced by some historians as far back as the days of Julius Caesar. Others are content to stop at Count Otho, in the 12th century, whom they regard as founder of the family, because, through his wife, he obtained large possessions in the Low Countries. The immediate ancestors of William Henry are renowned as fathers of the Dutch Republic, and from them he inherited patriotic virtues.

He was born in Holland on the 14th of November, 1650, the posthumous son of William II., who had in 1641 married Mary, the eldest daughter of Charles I. of England. He created the fondest hopes, and medals were struck to commemorate his auspicious birth. "Though the orange-tree be fallen down," so ran the Dutch legend in allusion to his father's death, "this noble sprig has been preserved, by Divine care, in the bosom of Mary. Thus the father arises after his death like a phenix in his son. May he grow, may he flourish, and in virtue excel the greatest princes, to the glory and safety of his country." At the age of

ten, the youth lost his mother, who died within her native shores in 1660, when on a visit to her brother Charles. The affectionate care of his grandmother could not make up for these bereavements, and this child of sorrow had the further misfortune to be deprived of the hereditary Stadholdership bestowed on his ancestors by the States General. With the death of his mother came the loss, for a time, of the Principality of Orange, which was unscrupulously seized by Louis XIV., who demolished the fortifications of the town. William's education fell into the hands of the Barneveldt party, headed by the two De Witts, who sought to break down his spirit, and refused him a range of education befitting his rank. Having been brought up in the Stadholder's Palace at the Hague—which then, as now, uniquely combined, in streams and woods, the quiet rusticity of a village, with the bustle and magnificence of a metropolis—he received a notice to quit his ancestral abode in his seventeenth year, and only retained the favourite residence, by declaring that nothing but force should tear him from its hearthstone. First made Captain and Admiral-General, and then forced by public acclamation into the position of Chief Magistrate when he was but twenty-two—at a time of tremendous peril—he had to bear the yoke in his youth. Nothing indeed could have saved his dominions just then but the magnanimity inspired by memories of his country's heroic struggles with Spain: that magnanimity he expressed in the well-known words, "There is one method which will save me from the sight of my country's ruin: I will die in the last ditch."

The man whom I have thus described had from infancy suffered from bad health. Asthma and con-

sumption—likely to be increased by the damp atmosphere and the unhealthy fogs which float about the Dutch dykes—rendered it necessary for him to be propped up in bed, when cruel headaches did not make repose impossible ; and soon after reaching manhood, he had to endure a severe attack of that virulent disease, small-pox. Such circumstances did not improve a melancholy temperament. Not naturally unamiable, William was grave and taciturn ; and amongst his original endowments we notice a judgment unaccompanied by imagination, but with a quick perception and a keen forecast, which made him sensitively alive to the responsibilities and issues of his own career. He saw himself entering a thorny road, which might conduct to prosperity or end in defeat ; at any rate, he resolved it should not lead to disgrace. In such circumstances and with such a character, we are not surprised to find him pronounced cold, reserved, and phlegmatic. His lofty forehead, piercing eyes, aquiline nose, and compressed lips, indicated energy of mind and force of will ; but attenuated features, delicate limbs, and feeble gait, betrayed the frailty of the framework which encased his soul.

People of his disposition at times reveal the existence of tender sensibilities. They form friendships limited in extent, but intense in degree. Nor do sallies of humour fail to sparkle in their sombre lives. William's almost romantic love for Bentinck, who watched him in illness, is generally known. Less noticed is the Prince's power of repartee. One day as he walked in the pleasant gardens of the Hague, the Grand Pensionary praised one of the parterres. "Yes," replied His Highness, "this garden is very fine, but there is

too much *white* in it." The lilies were abundant, but the Pensionary—whose name, De Witt, meant white—perceived at once that William was thinking more of him and of his influence than of the flowers smiling at his feet. Averse to fashionable amusements, he dearly loved the chase. He was, according to Sir William Temple, always in bed and asleep by ten o'clock ; and he preferred a "tumbler of cold ale" to a glass of the choicest wine.\*

The Prince paid a second visit to England in 1678, when he married his cousin, the Princess Mary—a match which, though suggested by State policy, turned out one of pure affection. It prepared the way for the part he was to play in the Revolution, and on account of that event, which, in its ecclesiastical consequences, forms a prominent subject in this volume, a glance at his early life has been deemed essential.

What most concerns us is not his military and political character, not his career as a soldier or a statesman, but his religious opinions, sympathies, and policy, and the bearing of these upon the changes wrought during his reign in the ecclesiastical affairs of our country. William was a staunch Calvinist. "He was much possessed with the belief of absolute decrees," and said to Burnet he adhered to them "because he did not see how the belief of Providence could be maintained upon any other supposition." † Such convictions in such a man became elements of heroism, but it was thought, not perhaps without reason, that more care had been taken to impress his mind with the

\* For the early life of the Prince of Orange, see "The Life of William III.," 8vo, Lond., 1703 ; "The Hist. of King William III.," 3 vols., 8vo, 1703 ; "The Life of William, Prince of Orange," 8vo, Lond., 1688.

† Burnet's "Own Time," II. 305, I. 689.

doctrine of Predestination, than to guard him against abuses incident to such an opinion. Yet there appears nothing fanatical in William's religion, and whatever might be his moral conduct, it did not seem to have been connected with Antinomian prejudices, or with any doubt of the obligations of Christian virtue. It is remarkable, that though in Holland, at the time of the Synod of Dort, Calvinism appeared in union with intolerance, William had no sympathy in that feeling. Toleration was a ruling idea in his mind; and he blamed the English Church for alienating itself from other communions, and for claiming infallibility in practice, though eschewing it in theory. He had been brought up a Presbyterian, but he appears to have regarded Church government of secondary importance, and, as events proved, he could conform to Episcopacy. Indeed, it is said by Burnet—who claimed to know him well—that he, on the whole, preferred the English to the Dutch type of ecclesiastical rule.\* The Prince had no reverence for antiquity, no æsthetic taste, no sensibility under the touch of elaborate ceremonies, or amidst the flow of harmonious music. He preferred an unritualistic worship, and distinctly disapproved of the surplice, the cross in baptism, and bowing to the altar; yet, again, we are assured that he highly esteemed the worship, as well as the polity, of the Church of England.

After his marriage with the Princess Mary, he formed an acquaintance with the English Divines. Dr. Hooper became chaplain to the Princess, on the recommendation of Archbishop Sancroft; and he remained in office a year and a half. The chaplain

\* "Own Time," I. 691. Burnet evidently wished to make William appear as much of a Churchman as possible.

found Her Royal Highness reading works favourable to Dissenters; to counteract their tendency, he recommended works of another description. One day the Prince observed his wife with the pages of Eusebius and Hooker open on her table, when he exclaimed, "I suppose Dr. Hooper persuades you to read these books?" She had at first no chapel of her own for Divine worship; at the Doctor's request, a room was fitted up, with a communion-table elevated on steps. The Prince, as he saw them being made, "rudely kicked at them," asking what they meant. Informed on the point, he answered "with a hum." After the chapel had been fitted up, he never attended Divine service there; and as this chaplain talked about the Popish Plot and the indulgence of Dissenters in terms less favourable to the latter than His Highness liked, he bluntly said, "Well, Dr. Hooper, you will never be a Bishop;" and on another occasion remarked if he had ever "anything to do with England, Dr. Hooper should be Dr. Hooper still."\* Ken succeeded Hooper in 1679; we have no particulars of his relations with William, but those relations do not seem to have been very cordial. Each of the clergymen now mentioned belonged to the High Church party, and William could not agree with either, so that the end of Ken's connection with the Dutch Court produced satisfaction on both sides. Yet the conduct of this excellent man "gained him entire credit and high esteem with the Princess, whom to his death he distinguished by the title of his Mistress."†

The sincerity and strength of William's Protestant-

\* These anecdotes are found in a MS. "Life of Hooper," by Prouse. See "Life of Ken," by a Layman, 101-103.

† Hawkins' "Life of Ken," 7.

ism was unmistakable. Protestantism had the approval of his intellect, and it penetrated his soul. In him, cold as he was, it existed not merely as an opinion, but as a passion. It accompanied him into the Cabinet and the field, tincturing all his views ; it pervaded all his purposes, shaped all his policy. Protestantism for Holland was his first thought, Protestantism for Europe his second ; and he saw dependent upon Protestantism the political, commercial, and social prosperity of nations, scarcely less than the spiritual well-being of individuals. Roman Catholicism to his mind was identical with a violation of the law of God and an invasion of the rights of man ; yet his large views of toleration embraced Roman Catholics ; he would not rob any man of his liberty of conscience, but the ascendancy of the Romanist system, and the tendency of its spirit, he thoroughly abhorred as one of the worst foes to the welfare of the race. France at that moment showed herself to be more violently Roman Catholic than the Pope himself, and was seeking to establish control over Europe. Therefore towards France William turned a gaze of defiance, prepared to shed the last drop of his blood in resisting her ambition. Louis XIV. stood forth as William's personal enemy, but William's history shows how much more he himself was swayed in this respect by reason than by resentment. At the same time he regarded Holland as one of the last defences of liberty, and desired to see England united with that country in the resistance of a common foe.

Mary responded to her husband's sentiments. Although nurtured in a Roman Catholic atmosphere, she proved herself entirely free from Roman Catholic predilections, and indicated a preference for Low Church

principles. A woman of reading, she turned her attention to the controversies of the day, and not only resisted the attempts of her father to convert her to Popery, but, with all her respect for Ken, kept herself free from the ecclesiastical views which that devout man resolutely upheld.

In 1686, Gilbert Burnet accepted an invitation to the Hague, and availed himself of opportunities to support the Low Church opinions of the Prince and his Consort. The historian of his “Own Time” has taken posterity into his confidence, and he relates, with characteristic vanity, how he advised his illustrious friends in matters of the highest importance. But whatever may be thought of Burnet’s foibles, he appears to have judiciously counselled both husband and wife, especially the latter, and to have done much towards a wise settlement of the Crown at the Revolution. His counsels were in favour of constitutional government and of toleration ; and he inculcated upon Mary that whenever she might inherit her father’s throne, she should use her influence to obtain for her husband real and permanent authority. Such advice laid the Prince, and the country of his adoption, under lasting obligations to the busy Whig Churchman.

As the peculiar relation in which this noble couple stood to this kingdom could not but interest them in English affairs, neither could it fail to attract towards them the attention of the English people. English Protestants sympathized with William in his continental policy. They disliked France almost as much as he did. The Huguenots driven to our shores were memorials before their eyes of Roman Catholic intolerance : and besides this, they knew what their own fellow countrymen naturalized in France had to suffer from

the repeal of the Edict of Nantes, and that the wives and children of those so naturalized had to suffer in the same way. Moreover, they learned that dragoons were quartered upon English merchants residing in France, to prevent their passing the frontiers, and to compel them to change their religion.\* These circumstances, backed by the humiliating fact, that the Stuarts were hirelings of Louis, brought the feelings of Protestant Englishmen into sympathy with those of the Netherland Stadholder. He, in his turn, looked with anxiety towards this country whilst suffering under the mis-government of James II. What James was doing for Dissenters by a stretch of prerogative, William wished to see done by constitutional law. Mary took a still more lively, because a patriotic, interest in these subjects, and disapproved of her father's despotism and Popery. For the Church of England she had a strong affection, which she expressed to Archbishop Sancroft, when congratulating him upon the firmness of the clergy in their religion as well as their loyalty.†

Matters in England were brought to a crisis in the month of June. Upon Trinity Sunday, the 10th of the month, two days after the imprisonment of the seven Bishops, London was thrown into frantic excitement by a report that James's Queen had presented him with a son and heir. A Popish successor would bring upon the country those calamities of which the prospect for two reigns had filled men with dismay. The bulk of the people could not believe the fact. They declared that the Queen had not been confined at all—that she for some time had worn a cushion under her dress—that her pretended son had been conveyed into her

\* Dalrymple's "Memoirs," I. 183.

† "Clarendon Correspondence," II. 484.

chamber in a silver warming-pan on a Sunday morning, when Whig lords and ladies, who otherwise might have detected the cheat, were lying in bed or were gone to prayers. Stories the most absurd and disgusting were believed. At that moment anything seemed more credible than the simple event which had really occurred. The news of this assumed Royal conspiracy flew over to Holland, and it created the utmost consternation, William and Mary sincerely believing what they were confidently told. At all events, the child—of whose supposititious character the idea vanished afterwards from all but the most fanatical minds—was publicly baptized in the Church of Rome, the Pope's Nuncio standing sponsor. This added to the national exasperation, and the Whig and Protestant party immediately began to think of seeking succour from Holland, and putting an end at all hazards to the existing state of things. William had before this become the head of the English opposition. Old Republicans and old Royalists, Anglican Churchmen who hated Rome, Latitudinarian Churchmen who loved liberty, and Evangelical Churchmen who believed in Calvinism—Presbyterians, Independents, and Baptists, the first anxious for comprehension, the second and third wishing only for freedom of worship—all had been turning their thoughts for some time to the Prince of Orange as the star of their hopes. English soldiers, English sailors, and English Divines, had publicly presented themselves in the old Gothic *Binnenhof* of the Hague, or held private interviews with the Dutch Governor. The Earl of Devonshire, Lord Shrewsbury, Admiral Herbert, Lord Lumley, and others, had written to His Highness, more or less explicitly, offering to devote to him their fortunes and their lives.

This went on in the spring of 1688, amidst excitements produced by the Declaration of Indulgence. Holland at the same period felt deep sympathy with England. Dr. Edmund Calamy, grandson of the well-known Puritan, in the early part of 1688 lived as a student at Utrecht, and he says there prevailed in the States a conviction that their own, and the Protestant interest in general, could be preserved only by a revolution in England, since nothing else could prevent Europe from being engulfed in France ; he adds, the Dutch were disposed to assist in making head against King James, and in relieving the people, who cried to them for succour, as they, a century before, had appealed for help to Queen Elizabeth.\*

A decided but perilous step was taken in England on the 30th of June, the day of the Bishops' acquittal. By a letter written amidst the excitement of that event, which shook not the English throne but him who sat on it, seven members of the Whig party invited the Prince of Orange to come over. They informed him of the prevalent dissatisfaction of the people with the Government, and of their willingness to rise in defence of their liberties, if His Highness would land with sufficient strength to put himself at the head of the Protestant party. They stated that the soldiers unequivocally manifested an aversion to the Popish religion ; that they certainly would desert the Royal standard in great numbers ; and that not one out of ten in the navy could be trusted in case of an invasion. They promised to attend on His Highness as soon as he should land ; and they commissioned a confidential messenger to consult with him about artillery and ammunition. This act of daring treason, or of tri-

\* Calamy's "Hist. Account," I. 147.

umphant patriotism, whichever the issue might determine it to be, decidedly turned the scales which quivered between further delay and immediate action. The “immortal seven,” as they have been called, who signed in cypher, were Shrewsbury, Devonshire, Danby, Lumley, Russel, Sydney, and Compton, Bishop of London. The conspirators—perfect in number like the Bishops, now at the moment of their acquittal and ovation—thus cast the die which *might* bring death, which *did* bring freedom. The adhesion of Compton to this scheme is what most concerns us, as it indicates the early infusion of an ecclesiastical element into this undertaking, an element which became deeper, wider, stronger, as time rolled on. In less than a month afterwards the same dignitary replied to a letter from the Prince concerning the trial of the seven Bishops, and informed him how sensible he and others were of the advantage of having so powerful a friend; that they would make no ill use of it; and that they were so well satisfied of the justness of their cause, that they would lay down their lives rather than forsake it.\*

William must for some time have been expecting overtures. They would not find a man of so much forecast unprepared; yet not a little remained to be done that the proposed descent might prove a success. The remainder of summer and the early part of autumn were spent in secret military preparations at home, in secret diplomatical negotiations abroad. He even decoyed the Pope into his toils, by baits which did more credit to his statesmanship than to his honesty. He persuaded His Holiness to advance money for an attack, as he thought, upon France, in reality upon England. Rome, ever trying to over-reach others, was

\* Dalrymple, III., Appen. Part I., 228, 238.

herself over-reached ; and help, supposed to be rendered for the humiliation of a power then inimical to the Papal Court, came to be applied to the overthrow of a Popish Sovereign and the strengthening of the cause of European Protestantism.

When the military movements in Holland became generally known, they were given out to be intended for a campaign against France, in which the Prince was to receive support from the Imperial army on the Rhine ; yet, whatever dust might be thrown in men's eyes, the real truth appeared to many. Even as early as the 7th of August, news of the Prince's intention to come over with an army reached the quiet cloisters of Westminster Abbey ; and Dr. Patrick, at four o'clock in the afternoon, received at his prebendal residence tidings of the important secret through his friend, Dr. Tenison, who came "to have some private conversation."\* But almost up to the last hour James remained in the dark, partly through his own obtuseness, partly, and much more, through the selfish designs of France, through the treachery of courtiers, and through denials made by the Dutch Ambassador. No doubt a clear-headed man, with a sharp eye, would have caught signs of the true direction of the brewing storm ; but a man like James, narrow-minded and prejudiced, might easily be duped by diplomatic arts and courtierly deceit. He persuaded himself into the belief that the rumours of a Dutch invasion of England were raised by the Court of France to promote his political interests and to bring him into closer alliance with Louis, a policy at that moment appearing to him most perilous, because it would be sure to increase his unpopularity with his subjects.

\* Patrick's "Works," IX. (Autobiography). 513.

His conduct after the acquittal of the Bishops proves that he had not learnt wisdom from that significant event. His treatment of the lawyers, in the face of public opinion, seems incredible. He honoured with a baronetcy Williams, the Solicitor-General, who led the prosecution ; and Holloway and Powell, who gave it as their opinion that the Bishops' petition did not amount to a libel, he punished by dismissal from the Bench.

To the Judges who went their circuits in the summer, Royal instructions were communicated to the effect, that they should persuade the people to assist in supporting the unpopular Declaration for liberty of conscience, telling them that a Parliament would speedily be called to make the Sovereign's favour statute law. Churchmen were to be assured of the fulfilment of His Majesty's promises ; and persons of all classes were to be reminded what a gracious Prince they had upon the throne. Liberty of conscience, they were to be informed, had advanced the trade, and would prove the means of increasing the population of the country. The tone was fair, the phraseology specious ; but the friends of freedom were not to be hoodwinked after this fashion. Justice Allybone, a reputed Papist, sought, at the Croydon Assizes, to give effect to these instructions, by the charge which he then delivered to the Grand Jury. The meaning which the Croydon Grand Jury would gather from his wretched rabble of words was, that he put in a plea for the toleration of Catholics, a plea which, however just, wore at that crisis a suspicious aspect, and could find no favour with the Surrey squires. Allybone finished by remarking that he would not have the world mistaken about the Bishops' trial—it was not for religion they

were tried, “they were tried for acting against the Government, for publishing a libel which tended to sedition. The King,” he said, “commands them with the advice of his Council for to publish his Declaration ; they would not do it. *If the King had been a Turk or Jew, it had been all one, for the subject ought to obey.*” \*

James’s proceedings in reference to the Church at this time were in keeping with the rest of his conduct. He issued an order, requiring Chancellors of Dioceses and Archdeacons to report to the High Commission the names of those who had not published the Declaration. This went too far even for his friends. Sprat, Bishop of Rochester, immediately resigned his seat, and the rest of the Commissioners becoming alarmed, as well they might, hesitated to proceed with the odious investigation. In the same month of July, the King sent a mandate to Oxford for the election of Jeffreys to the Chancellorship ; a disgrace which the authorities of the Universities prevented by stealing a march on the Monarch, and electing a Chancellor before the mandate arrived. On the 13th of August the King exercised anew his dispensing power, by charging the Wardens and Fellows of All Souls, Oxford, to admit John Cartwright to the Vicarage of Barking, notwithstanding any custom or constitution to the contrary.† Next, on the 23rd, he nominated to the Bishopric of Oxford, Timothy Hall, who had gained notoriety by reading the Declaration. Such persistency in an unpopular course increased national indignation ; all classes became more and more weary of this galling

\* Gutch’s “Collectanea Curiosa,” I. 393-397.

† Tanner MSS., 28, 113, printed in Gutch’s “Collectanea,” I.

despotism, and were goaded on to hasten the King's downfall.

Whilst such were the proceedings of the temporal head of the Church, what was the course pursued by the Primate? Sancroft despatched admonitions to the clergy of his province, exhorting them to the zealous discharge of their duties, and concluding his appeal by recommending them to show a friendly spirit towards Nonconformists, by visiting them and receiving them kindly at their own homes, with a view to persuade them "to a full compliance with our Church." They were to insist upon two points: that the Bishops were irreconcilable enemies to Rome, and that jealousies to the contrary were altogether groundless. Finally, clergymen were invited to pray for the union of all Reformed Churches, both at home and abroad, against their common foe, and that all who confessed the name of our dear Lord, might meet in one communion and live in godly love.\* Next, and more surprising, when we think of the Archbishop's High Church views, he is said to have engaged in a scheme of comprehension, the design being, so far as it can be gathered from a speech made long afterwards by Dr. Wake, to amend and improve the discipline of the Church; to review and enlarge the Liturgy, by correcting some things, by adding others; and, it is stated, that he proposed, if advised by authority, to have the matter considered first in Convocation, then in Parliament.† This would have been to walk in steps taken by Low Churchmen some years before, and to anticipate the endeavours of the same class of Churchmen some

\* July 27, 1688. Wilkin's "Concilia," IV. 618.

† D'Oyley's "Life of Sancroft," I. 326-328. I am very sceptical about this report.

months afterwards. When efforts had been made in that direction by Tillotson and others, the Archbishop had not showed the least disposition to help them ; and on the whole it appears to me that so cautious and conservative a man as Sancroft could never have intended to go the length which the reports just noticed might indicate to ecclesiastical reformers. Indeed, Wake, when he repeated the story, took care to add that the intended changes related "to things of more ordinary composition," whilst the doctrine, government, and worship of the Church were to remain entire. Probably the alterations contemplated by Sancroft were very slight indeed, and certainly they were conceded only in consequence of the excitement of the times.

Before the end of September, the King altered his policy ; he and the Archbishop came together, the former beginning at last to be frightened, the latter anxious to do what he could to save his master. On the 21st of September, a Declaration appeared, to the effect that it was the Royal purpose to provide a legal security for universal liberty of conscience, yet to preserve the Church of England in particular, and to secure the Protestant religion in general ; at the same time it was indicated that Roman Catholics were to remain incapable of being members of Parliament.\* Upon the 24th, Sancroft received a summons to attend the Royal presence, and a like command was sent to Compton, Mew, Trelawny, Sprat, and other Bishops. They were men of different mark : Compton had gone beyond any of his brethren in bold resistance of James's policy ; Mew had been a Royalist in the days of Charles I., and had fought as a soldier in his master's

\* *London Gazette*, 23<sup>84</sup>.

service ; Trelawny had won popularity by being one of the imprisoned seven, but had also shown a time-serving spirit. Sprat distinguished himself as an accommodating mortal ; the rest were High Churchmen, and supporters of the divine right of Kings.

On the day of dispatching the summons, James told Clarendon that the Dutch were coming in earnest to invade England. "And now, my Lord," he added, "I shall see what the Church of England men will do." On the 26th, the King saw Turner, Bishop of Ely, who reported that the conversation which arose was only of a general kind. Whatever liberal sentiments might have dawned on the Royal mind, all seemed dark on the 27th, when the Lord Chancellor informed Clarendon that some rogues had changed the King's purposes, that he would yield in nothing to the Bishops, "that the Virgin Mary was to do all."

The first meeting between the King and the Bishops took place on Friday, September the 28th. All invited were present, except Sancroft, who excused himself on the ground of being unwell, and Compton and Trelawny, who did not reach town in time. Their brethren, however, who, like them, were in the country when the command arrived, managed to be there. The Prelates came prepared honestly to give advice ; but James, no doubt under the influence mentioned by Clarendon, was very reserved, on the one hand declaring his goodwill to the Church of England, and on the other, reminding his spiritual advisers of their duty to be loyal to the Crown. Ken plainly expressed his disappointment, observing that "His Majesty's inclinations towards the Church, and their duty to him, were sufficiently understood and declared before, and would have been equally so if they had not stirred

one foot out of their dioceses." \* As the Prelates issued from the Royal presence, the courtiers loitering about the closet door, full of curiosity as to this much-talked-of interview, inquired, " How things went?" Mew—" poor man," as Clarendon calls him—answered, "*Omnia bene.*" † James wished to make capital for himself out of what had taken place, and immediately announced to his subjects, through the *Gazette*, that several of the Bishops having attended, he was pleased, amongst other gracious expressions, to let them know that he would signify his pleasure for taking off the suspension of the bishop of London, which was done accordingly. That any such communication was made could scarcely have been gathered from the account of the audience given by others. The same *Gazette* contained a Proclamation, dated September the 28th, stating, that undoubted advice had been received of a projected invasion from Holland, under false pretences relating to liberty, property, and religion, but really aiming at the conquest of the kingdom. The King declared his purpose to resist this attempt, to venture his life for the honour of the nation ; and deferring at present the meeting of Parliament, he called upon his subjects to resist their enemies, and prohibited any assistance being given them on pain of high treason.‡

The Bishops were dissatisfied with the interview of the 28th, and requested the Archbishop to procure another audience. One was appointed for Tuesday, the 2nd of October ; then it was postponed until the following day. The Prelates occupied the interval in careful deliberation, and drew up a paper, in which they advised, that the management of affairs in the

\* "Life of Ken," by a Layman, 317.

† "Clarendon Correspondence."      ‡ *Gazette*, 2386.

counties should be entrusted to qualified persons amongst the nobility and gentry; that the Ecclesiastical Commission should be annulled, dispensations terminated, the President and Fellows of Magdalen restored, licenses to Papists recalled, the Vicars Apostolical inhibited, vacant Bishoprics filled, "Quo Warrantos" superseded, charters restored, a Parliament called, in which, with due regard to the security of the Established Religion, liberty of conscience should be granted; and, finally, permission vouchsafed to the Bishops to attempt the re-conversion of His Majesty to the Protestant faith. The paper containing this advice was signed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Bishops of London, Winchester, Asaph, Ely, Chichester, Rochester, Bath and Wells, and Peterborough.\*

Before the Bishops were admitted to the conference, James made another concession to popular excitement, by declaring in Council to the Aldermen of London, his intention to restore to the City the much-prized charter of which it had been deprived. On the 3rd of October the second meeting of the Bishops with the King occurred. They presented their paper, and whatever the immediate effect of their last request might have been, they now received the assurance of a gracious consideration being given to their requests. The King almost immediately afterwards extinguished the Commission, and signified his purpose of rectifying corporate abuses.

Within a few days, collects were drawn up by the Bishops to be used in all cathedral, collegiate, and parochial churches and chapels within the kingdom during this time of public danger. They received His

\* "Tanner MSS." D'Oyley's "Life of Sancroft," I. 339-344.

Majesty's approval, and were printed for general use. It is curious to observe that they are so framed as to lay all the blame of existing calamities on the shoulders of the people, and to breathe a spirit of intense loyalty to His Majesty's person.

Upon the 12th of October, the King authorized the Bishop of Winchester to settle the troubles at Magdalen College ; but so suspicious had the public become in reference to the Royal sincerity, that it was currently and falsely reported immediately afterwards, that he had altered his mind, and withdrawn the order.\* Repeated Royal conferences could not be held without attracting attention. They became the subject of common talk, and the suspicious temper of people appeared in a rumour, that the right reverend fathers were being hoodwinked by a Popish Sovereign and his Popish Councillors. Evelyn wrote to Sancroft on the 10th of October, telling him that the calling of His Grace and the Bishops to Court, and what had been required of them, was only calculated to create jealousies and suspicions amongst well-meaning people—the whole of the plan being the work of Jesuits. He also complained that in all the Declarations published in pretended favour of the Church of England, there was not once any mention made of the Reformed or Protestant religion.†

The invitation to the Prince of Orange had been signed by the Bishop of London on the 30th of June. On the 2nd of November, a Declaration, bearing date the 10th of October, began to be circulated in England,

\* Macpherson ("Hist." I. 518) succinctly and completely refutes the assertion.

† Gutch, I. 414. In the Tanner MSS. are letters noticing charges against the Bishops.

the space between June and October having been spent by His Highness in making preparations for his enterprise. The document drawn up by the Grand Pensionary of Holland, had been revised and translated by Burnet, who sat by the Prince's elbow, and came to be described as "Champion in ordinary of the Revolution, and ready to enter the lists against all comers." The Declaration gave the utmost prominence to the religious question. An ecclesiastical and unconstitutional Court had been revived, which had misapplied the Church's property, invaded her dignity, and persecuted her members. A plan had been carried out for the re-establishment of Popery in Protestant England. Monasteries, convents, Popish churches, and Jesuit colleges had sprung up in all directions, and at the Council Board one of the hated order had taken his seat. Political liberties had been violated, charters withdrawn, Parliamentary government suspended, Judges displaced for their conscientiousness, and the right of petition denied even to spiritual Lords; Ireland had been given over to Papists, Scotland had been shorn of her freedom, and to crown all, the public had been deceived by the announcement of the birth of a pretended Prince. Hence the rights of the Princess of Orange had been invaded, and His Highness had undertaken an expedition "with no other view than to get a free Parliament assembled which might remedy those grievances, inquire into that birth, and secure national religion and liberty under a just and legal government for the future." He further stated that he had been earnestly solicited by many Lords, both spiritual and temporal, by many gentlemen, and by other subjects of all ranks, to interpose.\*

\* Dalrymple, I. 210.

After James had made his concessions, a postscript to the Declaration was received from William. The concessions, he urged, went to prove the truth of the charges made; they arose from a consciousness of guilt, no dependence could be placed upon them, and only a Parliament could re-establish the rights of the English people. Other documents of the same kind followed. The Prince boldly appealed to the military, reminding them how Protestant soldiers had been cashiered in Ireland, and Popish soldiers forced upon England. It would be the crime of the army, if the nation lost its liberty; the glory of the army, if the liberty of the nation was saved. Herbert wrote to the seamen, telling them their fate would be infamy, if the Prince failed of success; dismission from the service if he succeeded.

William's Declaration alarmed James. The webs woven by Dutch diplomacy were blown away. His confusion increased at finding he had reason to suspect there were Bishops amongst the Prince's allies. He sent in haste to Sancroft on the 16th of October, and told him of the intention to invade England, and he added, it would be a fitting thing for the Bishops to draw up a paper expressing their abhorrence of the attempt. The Primate plausibly pleaded that the Bishops had left London, and strangely declared, that he could not believe the Prince of Orange had any such design as was supposed. Matters were allowed to rest until the 31st of October, and then the King sent for Compton.\* He came next day. The King referred to William's Declaration, and read the paragraph stating that spiritual Lords had invited the Prince to come over. Compton, with a cunning which

\* D'Oyley, I. 355.

in a Papist he would have pronounced Jesuitical, replied, “I am confident the rest of the Bishops would as readily answer in the negative as myself.”\* This skilfully contrived evasion was a lie to all intents and purposes, but it took effect, for James admitted that he believed the Bishops were innocent. When he proceeded to urge a request that they should publicly disown any implication in this matter, his Lordship answered that the request should be considered. The King rejoined, that every one must answer for himself, and that he would send for the Archbishop to bring his brethren together.

Another important meeting followed on the 2nd of November, when the Bishop of London, with Crew, of Durham, and Cartwright, of Chester, both considered half Papists, and Watson, of St. David’s, a thorough courtier, were brought together at Whitehall, and the Archbishop following them there, conducted them into the Royal closet. The Archbishop explicitly denied having signed the invitation. The Bishop of London artfully said he had given his answer the day before. The Bishop of Durham declared, “I am sure I am none of them.” “Nor I.” “Nor I,” cried the other two. James proceeded to insist that they and their brethren on the Bench should publicly vindicate themselves, and express their abhorrence of William’s design. November the 3rd, the Bishops of London and Rochester went to Lambeth to dine with His Grace, but finding their brethren of Chester and St. David’s present, though uninvited, they proceeded to a friend’s house in the neighbourhood, and returned, between two and three o’clock, to the Palace, after the other two had

\* Compton’s own account. (Gutch I. 443.)

left. Then they conferred with Sancroft as to what should be done.\*

A meeting of this kind again took place on November the 6th, when the Archbishop, and the Bishops of London, Rochester, and Peterborough, made their appearance in the Sovereign's presence ; the Bishop of St. David's, who was throughout an object of suspicion, "waiting for them in the Guard-chamber, ready to thrust in with them to the King." The Primate, taking Lord Preston aside, requested him to procure for them a private audience ; upon which the King, through his Lordship, ordered the obnoxious and forward Prelate to withdraw. The rest told James they had done all they could, and that if he were satisfied, they did not care for other people's opinions ; but when he talked to them of such a paper as he had required, they fell back on the ground they had occupied before, that scarcely one in five hundred believed in the genuineness of the document published in the Prince's name. The Archbishop did not touch the question of the paper so much wished for by James, although one had been drawn up, and signed by himself ; most probably the reason of this omission was, that he could not carry his brethren with him in the matter, and he felt it would not do to make a solitary disavowal on the subject. Presently the dispute wandered into a confused maze, and the Archbishop could not help adverting to the treatment which he and his six brethren had received at the Royal hands. The King was annoyed, but the Primate persevered ; the rest supported him,

\* Whether or not on this occasion a paper was introduced by Sancroft of the kind demanded by the King, certainly such a paper is in existence, bearing date the day of this meeting. (Gutch II. 366.)

and His Majesty stood like a stag at bay. James retorted that if they complained, he had a right to complain too, and the quarrel became unseemly in the extreme. Indeed, His Majesty was now beginning to find that “whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap,” and as he had by his lawyers bearded the Bishops in his Court at Westminster, the Bishops in return were bearding him in his Palace of Whitehall. The conversation came round to the old point. James wanted them to sign a paper. They would not. “I am your king,” he said; “I am judge what is best for me. I will go my own way; I desire your assistance in it.” Go his own way he might, but they would not go with him. Whatever their high notions of Royal prerogatives, and the obligations of subjects, might have been once, the recent trial had wonderfully opened the eyes of their understanding. They would not take on themselves the responsibility of publishing any disclaimer. His Majesty might publish to the world what they had said, if he liked.\* “No,” said he; “if I should publish it, the people would not believe me.” Not believe him? The confession was most humiliating. “Sir,” said the right reverend father, “the word of a King is sacred—it ought to be believed.” “They that could believe me guilty of a false son, what will they not believe of me?” was the bitter rejoinder. James’ credit had sunk as low as it could. Further

\* The following paragraph, omitted by D’Oyley, occurs in the original document: “Here also something was added which I (the Bp. of Rochester) do not distinctly remember. I think it was to this effect, that this way of men’s being so called to purge themselves might be a thing of very tender concernment to the liberties and properties of the subject, especially of the Peers, and therefore we begged His Majesty would require no more of us in particular, but would rest contented with publishing this our declaration of our innocence.” (Tanner MSS.)

talking was useless. "I will urge you no further," said he, in conclusion. "If you will not assist me as I desire, I must stand upon my own legs, and trust to myself and my own arms." So they were dismissed.\*

One of the Bishops, writing on the 14th of October, had remarked, "All people's mouths are now full of praises for our order, to whom they say they shall ever owe the preservation of our religion," a statement which should be considered in connection with what I have said as to letters of a different purport addressed to Sancroft. The fact seems to have been, that whilst some churchmen were dissatisfied with irregularities in the Establishment which they blamed the Bishops for not correcting, others, a far larger number, looking chiefly at that moment to the religious and political liberties of the country, regarded certain of the Bishops as making a noble stand against the designs of James. The Bishops' popularity increased the following month, and although Compton's Jesuitical answer to the King must be condemned by everybody, and the doubts expressed by the Bishops present at the interview on the 6th, as to the genuineness of William's Declaration, will appear to most people as reflecting either upon their judgment or their straightforwardness—still their determination not to submit to James' dictation was in harmony with the spirit which had made the seven so popular. Their firmness in this respect, in connection with the resistance offered to James by other Prelates not present on this last occasion, and responsible neither for Compton's equivocation or their brethren's remarks about the Orange documents—certainly operated in favour of the approaching Revolution, the full nature of which, however, they did not foresee.

\* Gutch, I. 426-440.

The day before this 6th of November, a momentous event had occurred, of which at the time they knew nothing. William had set sail from Holland on the 16th of October, with a flag floating over the quaint, high-built frigate, bearing an inscription, of which the first three words formed the motto of the House of Orange, “I will maintain the liberties of England and the Protestant religion.” As it fluttered on the staff, the wind changed, the fleet had to put back; but the Declaration of the 10th, sent before him, announced his coming, and people, as they awaited the visitation, looked out to sea, and prayed for a “Protestant east wind” to waft over the desired Deliverer. Whilst James was talking to the Bishops on the 2nd of November, the ship had left Helvoetsluys, and after sailing northward, had tacked about a second time, and with a fair wind was making for the British Channel. In the fleet with the Prince was Frederic, Count of Schomberg, who, though he had been in the service of Louis XIV., remained a staunch member of the Reformed Church, and entered heartily into the design of the Protestant Champion, whom he attended in the capacity of Lieutenant. Another distinguished officer was Isaac Dumont de Bostaquet, a Huguenot soldier who had suffered for his religion, and had been driven from his paternal chateau of La Fontelaye, in France, by the intolerant policy of his infatuated Sovereign. Narrowly escaping with his life, after a number of romantic adventures, he found refuge in Holland, and now placed his sword at the command of the Prince, with all the zeal which could be kindled in the cause of liberty by memories of tyranny and oppression. In William’s dragoon regiments of red and blue were fifty French officers, all more or less inspired by similar

feelings. Two companies of French infantry were commanded by Captains de Chauvernay and Rapin-Thoyras, afterwards the historian of England. Perhaps the equipment of these soldiers, dusty, worn, and tattered, appeared to disadvantage when compared with the brilliant uniforms of the Dutch, the German, the Swedes, the Swiss, and the English, who crowded within the wooden walls ; but they deserve more notice than they have received, and more gratitude than was ever paid them. There were other noteworthy men amongst William's followers. Burnet was there, full of Dutch memories, full of English hopes, picking up knowledge from the sailors, and musing upon the issue of his patron's enterprise, not without side glances at his own fortunes. Not far off stood Carstairs, a catholic-spirited Scotch Presbyterian, who had manifested the utmost fortitude under torture, and who, when his own cause rose to the ascendant, did what is rare, for he signally manifested the virtue of moderation. Beside him was a different character, Robert Ferguson, implicated in the Rye-house Plot, and a ring-leader in Monmouth's rebellion.

The fleet presented a magnificent spectacle. "Nothing could be more beautiful," says Dumont de Bostaquet, "than the evolution of the immense flotilla which now took place under a glorious sky ;" \* and Rapin, recording his own impressions of the moment, observes, "What a glorious show the fleet made ! Five or six hundred ships in so narrow a channel, and both the English and French shores covered with numberless spectators is no common sight. For my part, who was then on board the fleet, it struck me extremely." Such a fleet, known to be conveying an army to the

\* Smiles' "Huguenots," 256.

coast, watched on its way with imperfect information and with mingled fear and hope, must have been to Englishmen a spectacle full of excitement, to which history records scarcely a parallel.

The 4th of November being Sunday, and also the Prince's birthday, he spent in devotion. Intending to land at Torbay, he found himself carried beyond his destination by the violence of the wind, or the unskillfulness of the pilot ; and some measure of agitation—such as thrilled the multitudes straining their eyes on the Dover Cliffs, whilst the quaintly built vessels passed by—must have moved the inhabitants of the towns and villages on both sides the sweep of water at the mouth of the Ex : as we imagine, on the red sand hills, groups gathered here and there, peering through windy weather in search of the ships about to rest under the headland of Devonshire Tor. The next day, the Dutch reached the desired spot. The Prince stepped upon shore at the town of Brixham, and the piece of rock which he touched with his foot has been removed from the spot, and inserted in a wall close by, which encloses the little fishing-harbour. And “the forces were landed with such diligence and tranquillity, that the whole army was on shore before night.”\* The associations of the year and the day were propitious. Just a century before, God had scattered the Spanish Armada ; and on the 5th of November, 1605, the three Estates of England had been delivered from the Gunpowder Plot. The Calvinist William took the Arminian Burnet by the hand, asking, “Will you not believe in predestination ?” “I will never forget,” the chaplain cautiously replied, “that providence of God which has appeared so signally on this occasion.” Public worship followed

\* Rapin, III. 285.

the landing. Carstairs was the first, "Scotsman and Presbyterian as he was," to call down the blessings of Heaven on the expedition; and after his prayer, "the troops all along the beach, at his instance, joined in the 118th Psalm," and this act of devotion produced a sensible effect on the troops.\* The Prince for a while seemed elated, yet soon relapsed into his habitual gravity; but Burnet only interpreted the general feeling of the moment when he says, "We saw new and unthought-of characters of a favourable providence of God watching over us."†

Tidings of what had happened rapidly spread, and excited all sorts of people, especially such as had religious sympathies with the new visitors. Devonshire traditions afford an idea of what was felt and done by Dissenters. A lady, worshipping in a meeting-house at Totnes, in commemoration of the discovery of Gunpowder Plot, when she learnt that the Prince had reached the neighbouring bay, immediately hastened in company with another like-spirited matron, to meet His Highness, at Brixham, who "shook hands with them, and gave them a parcel of his Proclamations to distribute, which they did so industriously that not one was left in the family as a memorial of their adventure." A purse of crimson and gold, and a pincushion, which she is said to have worn at her girdle on that occasion, together with her chain and locket, are still preserved as precious relics in a Non-conformist family descended from this admirer of the Dutch deliverer. The lady, no doubt, represented a

\* Dr. Stanley, whose words I have quoted, refers to McCormick's preface to Carstairs. ("State Papers, Lectures on the Church of Scotland," 116.)

† Burnet's "Own Time," I. 789.

numerous class ; and her zeal in espousing the Prince's cause was increased by the remembrance of what had befallen her friends under Judge Jeffreys, for she had harboured one of the "Taunton maids," who was concealed for some time on the roof of a house at the entrance to Totnes Priory. The place could be reached only by a ladder, and the poor girl's food was conveyed to her at night with the utmost secrecy.\*

A story is also told to the effect that Roman Catholics were at the time eagerly expecting assistance from the French, and that a priest with his friends, stationed on a watch-tower, having descried white flags on the men of war as they hove in sight, prepared an entertainment for the earnestly desired guests, and proceeded to chant a "Te Deum," in gratitude for their arrival. They were soon undeceived, and the fare provided for the French was enjoyed by the Dutch.†

The army next day marched on to Exeter, under heavy rains, through Devonshire highways, as the last tints of autumn had touched the trees ; officers, like men, wet to the skin, having neither change of raiment, nor food, nor horses, nor servants, nor beds, the baggage still remaining in the ships. But expressions of sympathy, perhaps timorously conveyed, cheered them somewhat on this dreary day, and stories are still circulated amongst the Nonconformist families of the neighbourhood, of ancestors who watched the landing, and spoke of "seeing the country people rolling apples down the hill-side to the soldiers." The grandson of an old farmer, who died at an advanced age a few years ago, used to state that when he was a boy he knew an old man over ninety, who told him how he, and others, were sent by his master, to the high road,

\* Local tradition.

† "Harl. Miscell., I. 449.

with cart-loads of apples, that the Prince's troops might help themselves.

Macaulay mentions the fact that Sir Edmund Seymour was the first person of importance who joined the Prince at Exeter. It is however believed that the two had privately met, before Sir Edward publicly gave in his adhesion. A cottage exists near Longcombe, on the borders of the parish of Berry Pomeroy, adjoining Totnes, still known as "Parliament House," where the Prince is said to have held a Council. It is situated on what was the property of Sir Edward, in a retired spot, and not above two miles from the line of march from Brixham to Newton.

The progress was slow, and the stay at the western capital long. Thomas Lamplugh, the Bishop who had approved of the Declaration and of the conduct of His Majesty's servile Judges, showed his fidelity to James by rushing up to London, where he was rewarded with the Archiepiscopal throne of York. York had been left vacant for more than two years and a half, with the design, it was said, of being ultimately occupied by a Roman Catholic. A Popish Bishop had been settled there, with a title *in partibus infidelium* whose crosier and utensils were seized after the landing of the Prince of Orange.\* The Dean of Exeter fled in alarm, and His Highness took up his abode in the deserted Deanery. The Prebendaries refused to meet him, or to occupy their stalls when he marched in military state through the western portal, well studded with statues of saints and kings; and proceeding up the nave, with its exquisite minstrels' gallery, ascended the steps of the choir, passed under the beautiful screen, and took his seat on the Episcopal throne, the orna-

\* Le Neve's "Archbishops," 269.

mentation of which in ebonlike oak, without a single nail in the curious structure, so admirably contrasts with the pale arches and the vaulted roof. As soon as the chanting of the "Te Deum" had ceased, Burnet read His Highness's Declaration, which proved a signal for such of the clergy and choristers as had ventured on being present, to quit the edifice. At the end of the reading the Doctor cried, "God save the Prince of Orange!" to which some of the congregation responded with a hearty Amen. De Bostaquet, the French Huguenot, accustomed to the extreme and rigid simplicity of Protestant worship in his own country, was scandalized at what he witnessed at Exeter. He regarded the English service as retaining nearly all the externals of Popery, for such he counted the altar, and the great candles on each side, and the basin of silver-gilt between, and the Canons, in surplices and stoles, ranged in stalls on each side the nave, and the choir of little boys singing with charming voices. He was touched somewhat by the beauty of the music, but the sturdy and ultra-Reformer declared it was all opposed to the simplicity of the French reformed religion, and he confessed he was by no means edified with it.\*

Burnet delivered a sermon on the following Sunday ; and on the same day, Robert Ferguson, being refused by the Presbyterians the keys of the meeting-house in St. James Street, exclaimed, "I will take the kingdom of heaven by violence!" and calling for a hammer, broke open the door. Sword in hand he mounted the pulpit, and preached against the Papists from the 16th verse of the 94th Psalm : "Who will rise up for me

\* Quoted in Smiles' "Huguenots," 256.

against the evildoers?"\* News of the landing and what followed speedily fled abroad. Cautious sympathy in the movement is expressed in the old Axminster Church Book. "On the fifth day of the ninth month the land was invaded by a vast body of men, of a strange language, having for their general, the Prince of Orange, who in a few days marched through the land with vast preparations for war. A Popish army was sent down from the King to meet him ; many of the King's officers and soldiers that favoured the Protestant interest, dropt away from the King, and joined in with the invaders." The Popish army was "totally routed, scattered, and subdued." "In the meanwhile the Churches and people of God held their assemblies for the public worship of God very peaceably. This Church, enjoying the same privilege, even while multitudes of soldiers lay in the town of Axminster, and marched along by the public meeting-house."

At first the Prince's affairs wore an unfavourable appearance, people of influence did not join him ; but before long the tide turned, "and every man mistaking his neighbour's courage for his own, all rushed to the camp or to the stations which had been assigned them, with a violence proportioned to their late fears."† A hearty welcome, however, awaited His Highness in many places through which he marched, the Dissenters in particular hailing his approach. One of them, a country gentleman, living at Coaxden Hall, rich in rookeries, between Axminster and Chard, had tables spread with provisions under an avenue of trees leading up to the house. The gentleman was Richard Cogan,

\* I give this story as it is found in the "Harleian Miscellany," and Murch's "Hist. of the Presbyterian Churches."

† Dalrymple, I. 225.

whose wife Elizabeth, before her marriage, concealed him under a feather-bed, after the Monmouth rebellion, and so saved his life and won his affections. His mother had been a Royalist; and amongst many stories told of Charles' adventures after his defeat at Worcester, it is related that this lady covered him with the skirts of her enormously-hooped petticoats.\* The clergy of Dorset found themselves in an awkward position after William had triumphantly passed through the country. They had received an order of Council, sent by the Bishop, prescribing prayers for the Prince of Wales and the Royal family. But now, although some persevered in using the prayers, others laid them aside. There still exists a letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury from the incumbent of Wimborne, asking what he should do under the circumstances.†

When Ken heard that the Dutch were coming to Wells, he immediately left the city, and in obedience to His Majesty's general commands, took all his coach horses with him, and as many of his saddle horses as he could; seeking shelter in a village near Devizes, intending to wait on James, should he come into that neighbourhood. Ken was awkwardly situated, having been chaplain to the Princess of Orange, and knowing many of the Dutch officers; therefore, to prevent suspicion, he left his diocese, determined to preserve his allegiance to a Monarch who still occupied the throne.‡ William found himself in the neighbourhood where the unfortunate Duke of Monmouth had a few years earlier unfurled his flag, to which certain Non-conformists had been drawn, who paid a terrible

\* Note in Wilson's "Life of Defoe," I. 110.

† "Tanner MSS.," XXVIII. 311. Dec. 29, 1688.

‡ Ken's "Life," by a Layman, 324.

penalty for their rashness. Many retained keen recollections of Sedgmoor fight and Taunton Assizes, and could scarcely calculate upon the success of this new attempt ; yet they sympathized intensely in William's designs, as is manifest from some of their Church records containing narratives of the Deliverer's march through the West of England. The Declaration said little in favour of Nonconformists, and only by implication gave hopes to them of legal security. But the documents received an interpretation from the knowledge that William believed conscience to be God's province, and that toleration is as politic as it is righteous.

Three days before the landing of the Prince, James admonished his subjects upon peril of being prosecuted, not to publish the treasonable Proclamations ; and on the day after the landing, he denounced the act as aiming at the immediate possession of the Crown. Between those two dates, the Scottish Bishops, whose feudal-like loyalty mastered their patriotism, and placed them in opposition to their Episcopal brethren of the South, sent an address to the falling Monarch, in which they denounced the invasion, and professed unshaken allegiance to be part of their religion ; not doubting that God, who had often delivered His Majesty, would now give him the hearts of his subjects and the necks of his enemies.\* Another Scotch address, breathing the utmost devotion, followed, in significant opposition to the ominous silence maintained by Englishmen. This flash of enthusiasm, however, on the other side the Tweed, did nothing for the salvation of the House of Stuart, the current of opinion through-

\* See *Gazette*, Nov.

out the realm, amongst high and low, having set in the opposite direction.

At this critical moment, amidst the confusion which reigned at Whitehall, and as selfish courtiers were waiting to see how they could promote their own interests, the misguided Sovereign commanded his army to march towards Salisbury. The night before he himself started for that city, a few noblemen and Bishops waited upon him with a proposal to assemble Parliament, and treat with the Prince of Orange; when, according to his own account, he told the Prelates that it would much better become men of their calling to instruct the people in their duty to God and the King, rather than foment a rebellious temper, by presenting such petitions at the very moment the enemy stood at the door. He says he regarded them as making religion a cloak of rebellion, and was at last convinced that the Church's doctrine of passive obedience formed too sandy a foundation for a Prince's hope.\* His answer to the request for a Parliament, according to the report of the Bishop of Rochester, ran in these words: "What you ask of me, I most passionately desire, and I promise you upon the faith of a king, that I will have a Parliament, and such an one as you ask for, as soon as ever the Prince of Orange has quitted this realm. For how is it possible a Parliament should be free in all its circumstances, as you petition for, whilst an enemy is in the kingdom, and can make a return of near a hundred voices?"†

James reached Salisbury on the 19th of November, and took up his abode in the Episcopal Palace, under the shadow of the spire which rises so gracefully out

\* "Life of James II.," II. 209-212.

† Sprat's "History of the Desertion," 62.

of the midst of a pleasant landscape of quaint-looking houses, gardens and orchards, green meadows and brown fields. There he had reason to be alarmed by the progress of events, and to reflect on the instability of worldly greatness ; yet he did not despair. He was wonderfully slow in giving up all hope of help from Bishops. To the last he seemed to cling to that order with the tenacity of a sailor who has seized on a plank from a foundered vessel. From Salisbury he sent for the Bishop of Winchester, who had cautiously remained at his princely castle during these troublous times. The Bishop wrote to the Archbishop of Canterbury an account of this fruitless visit : " His Majesty's intimation to me, that he thought my presence would, if occasion required, very much influence his army, I could not take it for less than a command, and accordingly posted to Sarum, where I pressed him, with all imaginable arguments, to call a Parliament, as the most visible way to put a stop to those confusions which threatened the Government ; and I left him in a far more inclinable disposition to it than I found him, and engaged several persons near him to second what I had attempted."\*

A spirit of disaffection soon showed itself in the upper ranks. Lord Lovelace had been deeply involved in intrigues preparatory to the Revolution ; and in a crypt under his Elizabethan mansion, called Lady Place, at Hurley, on the banks of the Thames, he had held midnight conferences whilst all the Whigs were longing for a Protestant wind. He now quitted his home, at the head of seventy followers, and galloped westward to join the Prince. Colchester, Wharton, Russel, and Abingdon proceeded in the same direction ;

\* Farnham Castle, Nov. 25, 1688. ("Tanner MSS., XXVIII.)

but, what foreboded more mischief, defection broke out in the ranks of Royalism. Cornbury, eldest son of Lord Clarendon, and nephew of James' first wife, at the head of three regiments, deserted the camp at Salisbury, and joined the Prince, most of his soldiers, more faithful than himself, deserting him, when they discovered his treachery. Still worse defections followed. Prince George of Denmark, the husband of the Princess Anne, James' daughter—a person who, with all her weakness of mind, had acquired a reputation for Protestant zeal—went next. In company with the Duke of Ormond, he rode off from Andover, having the previous night supped at his father-in-law's table. The Churchills, great favourites with James, great supporters of his cause, soon fell into the stream. The destined hero of Blenheim, accompanied by Grafton, pushed on his way to worship the rising sun. A story is told, I do not know on what authority, that William, on seeing these unexpected visitors, exclaimed, “If ye be come peaceably to me to help me, mine heart shall be knit unto you, but if ye be come to betray me to mine enemies (seeing that there is no wrong in my hands), the God of your fathers rebuke it.” One of them replied, “Thine are we, David, and on thy side, thou son of Jesse. Peace, peace, be unto thee, and peace be to thy helpers, for thy God helpeth thee.” The Princess Anne, imitating her husband's example, disappeared from Whitehall, and in a carriage, preceded by Compton, Bishop of London, who wore a purple velvet coat and jack boots, with pistols in his holsters and a sword in his hand,\* was driven off at the top of her horses' speed to the town of Nottingham.

\* Ralph, I. 1073.

The desertions at Salisbury drove James back to London ; there the last drop was added to the cup of his domestic sorrow, when he learned that his daughter Anne had abandoned his cause. Further calamities befell him. Rochester, Godolphin, even Jeffreys, meeting their master in the Council, recommended the calling of a Parliament ; and at the same time Clarendon blamed James for leaving Salisbury without fighting a battle. Eventually, after having bewailed his son Cornbury's apostacy, the great courtier thought it the safest course to imitate that son's example. James was now reduced to extremities, and on the 22nd of November he issued a Proclamation, in which he recalled his revolted subjects to allegiance with the promise of a free and gracious pardon, and tempted the soldiers of the Dutch army to come over to the Royal standard with the promise of liberal entertainment, or of safe dismissal to their own country. On the 30th, appeared another Proclamation, for the speedy calling of a Parliament.\*

Matters were proceeding favourably on the other side. Crossing Salisbury Plain, marching past Stonehenge, William and his army, with great military display, took possession of Salisbury, after which the Prince occupied a house in the neighbouring village of Berwick. Clarendon, on reaching the Episcopal city, which had become the head-quarters of the Revolution, alighted at the George Inn, where he found the Dutch Ambassador ; and the next morning waited on the Prince, who took him into his bed-chamber, and talked with him for half an hour, telling him how glad he felt to see him, and how seasonable the accession of his son had proved. The Earl, hearing Burnet was in the

\* *Gazettes* under dates.

house, went to see that important person. "What," asked the latter, "can be the meaning of the King's sending these Commissioners?" "To adjust matters for the safe and easy meeting of the Parliament," replied Clarendon. "How," rejoined the other, "can a Parliament meet, now the kingdom is in this confusion—all the West being possessed by the Prince's forces, and all the North being in arms for him?" Clarendon urged that if the design was to settle things, they might hope "for a composure." The Doctor, with his usual warmth, answered, "It is impossible: there can be no Parliament: there must be no Parliament. It is impossible!"\*

Clarendon made his way to Berwick where a house used by the Prince at the time was in the possession of one of Clarendon's relatives; there he had a private conference with His Highness, and was received "very obligingly." The Earl wished that the opposing parties might come to terms, and talked with Burnet, who, walking up and down the room, in wonderful warmth exclaimed, "What treaty? How can there be a treaty? The sword is drawn. There is a supposititious child, which must be inquired into." Clarendon was puzzled at Burnet's conduct, and asked him why the day before, at prayers in the Cathedral, he had behaved so as to make the congregation stare; for when the usual collect for the Sovereign was being repeated, he sat down in his stall and made an "ugly noise." Burnet replied, he could not join in the usual supplications for James as King of England.†

As William rode on horseback from Berwick to Salisbury, the people flocked to see and bless him.

\* Clarendon's "Diary," Dec. 3rd; II. 214.

† Ibid., Dec. 5th, 6th.

He acknowledged their affectionate salutations by taking off his hat, saying, "Thank you, good people. I am come to secure the Protestant religion, and to free you from Popery."

William's popularity advanced with hasty strides from the south to the north and east of England, obtaining marked manifestation in certain towns and cities, connected with other and somewhat similar struggles. The nobility and gentry of the northern midland counties met at Derby, and there they declared it to be their duty to endeavour the healing of present distractions, as they apprehended the consequences which might arise from the landing of an army. They wished there should be the calling of a free Parliament, to which the Prince of Orange was willing to submit his pretensions. At Nottingham, the refuge of the Princess Anne, many of the upper and middle classes assembled, to enumerate grievances under which the nation groaned. The laws, as they said, had become a nose of wax, and being sensible of the influence of Jesuitical councils in the Government, they avowed their determination not to deliver posterity over to Rome and slavery, but to join with the Prince in recovering their almost ruined laws, liberties, and religion. At York, Sir Henry Gooderick, in the Common Hall, addressed a hundred gentlemen to this effect, "that there having been great endeavours made by the Government of late years to bring Popery into the kingdom, and by many devices to set at nought the laws of the land," there could be no proper redress of grievances "but by a free Parliament." Alarmed by flying reports of what the Papists were about to do, the Earl of Danby, Lord Horton, Lord Willoughby, and others, scoured the streets of the city at the head

of a troop, shouting, “A free Parliament, the Protestant religion, and no Popery!”\* At Newcastle and at Hull demonstrations occurred in favour of a free Parliament. In the Market-place of Norwich, the Duke of Norfolk addressed the Mayor and citizens, and talked of securing law, liberty, and the Protestant religion. Just afterwards, the townsmen of King’s Lynn responded to the Duke in a strain like his own. Berwick-on-Tweed followed in the wake of other towns. Even the heads of Houses at Oxford sent to the Prince an assurance of support, and an invitation to visit them, saying that their plate, if needful, should be at his service.†

I have shown that treachery weakened the cause of James; I am sorry to say, falsehood was employed in support of William. Two genuine Declarations were published in his cause, a third appeared, of a most violent description. It stated as his resolution, that all Papists found with arms on their persons or in their houses, should be treated as freebooters and banditti, be incapable of quarter, and be delivered up to the discretion of his soldiers; all persons assisting them were to be looked upon as partakers of their crimes. It stated, also, that numerous Papists had of late resorted to London and Westminster, that there was reason to suspect they did so, not for their own security, but in order to make a desperate attempt upon those places; and that French troops, procured by the interest and power of the Jesuits, would, if possible, land in England.‡ Burnet, who was in the secrets of the Prince’s Court, observes, “No doubt was made that it was truly the Prince’s Declaration; but he knew nothing of it; and it was never known

\* Reresby, 363, 364. † Burnet, I. 793.

‡ Ralph, I. 1051.

who was the author of so bold a thing." \* It has been said † that the Declaration was not made public until after the Prince had left Sherborne. William did not issue any counter Declaration nor publish any repudiation of the document, but left it to produce its effect. Such a want of straightforwardness contradicts his general character, but most likely those about him, seeing how effective the Declaration proved, prevented its being cancelled. Years afterwards one Speke, who had been in the Prince's army, and who was goaded by revenge for his brother's death under Judge Jeffreys, avowed himself the fabricator of the infamous device, and said that he gave it to the Prince with his own hand ; that His Highness seemed somewhat surprised at first, but that when he had considered it, he was not displeased. No credit can be given to such a witness. Part of his statement is improbable, and is contradicted by Burnet.

James fled to Sheerness, having burnt the unissued Parliamentary writs, and thrown into the Thames the Great Seal of the realm. Arrived at Sheerness, he fell into the hands of the rabble, upon which, as De Foe relates, "he applied himself to a clergyman in words to this effect : 'Sir, 'tis men of your cloth have reduced me to this condition : I desire you will use your endeavour to still and quiet the people, and disperse them, that I may be freed from this tumult.' The gentleman's answer was cold and insignificant, and going down to the people, he returned no more to the King." ‡

What was to be done ? Amidst consternation inde-

\* Burnet, I. 793.

† See Sprat's "History of the Desertion."

‡ Wilson's "Life of De Foe," I. 159.

scribable, some of the Peers resolved to hold a meeting in Guildhall. At this meeting, held December the 10th, amidst the temporal Lords there appeared the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, and the Bishops of Winchester, Asaph, Ely, Rochester, and Peterborough. The Archbishop of Canterbury presided, and a sub-committee of three or four drew up a Declaration, in which they promised to assist the Prince of Orange in obtaining a Parliament for the welfare of England, the security of the Church, and the freedom of Dissenters. A deputation was appointed to wait upon His Highness. Riots followed. "No Popery" became the general cry. Roman Catholic chapels were stripped of furniture, in some instances the buildings were demolished. Oranges, symbolic of the Deliverer, were stuck on the ends of spikes and staves, and waved in triumph. The Embassies of Roman Catholic countries were no longer safe, and the mansion of the Spanish Minister was sacked. One act of vengeance will surprise no one who has read the story of the previous reign : Jeffreys, disguised as a sailor, fell into the hands of the mob, and narrowly escaped with life. Speke, not satisfied with the fictitious Declaration, invented terrific stories about massacres, which he said were already begun by the Irish. All kinds of atrocities were to be perpetrated by the disbanded army. De Foe repeated that, "the Irish dragoons which had fled from Reading, rallied at Twyford, and having lost not many of their number—for there were not above twelve men killed—they marched on for Maidenhead, swearing and cursing, after a most soldierly manner, that they would burn all the towns wherever they came, and cut the throats of the people." He adds, that as he himself rode to

Maidenhead, he learnt at Slough that Maidenhead had been burnt, also Uxbridge and Reading. When he came to Reading, he was assured Maidenhead and Oakingham were in flames.\* Imagination invented all kinds of horrors. In consequence of Speke's letters came the *Irish night*, as it is called, when the citizens of London, in the utmost terror at the thought of insurgents entering their gates and murdering them in their beds, sat up till morning, drums beating to arms, women screaming in agony, lights blazing at windows, streets lined with soldiers, and the doors of houses barricaded against the fancied foe. The panic could not be confined to the Metropolis. It spread to the North, it reached Leeds. Stories were told of Papists at Nottingham burning and slaying all before them, whereupon, the people of Leeds mended their fire-arms, fixed scythes on poles, kept watch and ward, and sent for the military, who came in such force that they amounted to seven thousand horse and foot. This pacified the inhabitants, until in the middle of the night there rose a cry, "Horse and arms! horse and arms!—the enemy are upon us! Beeston is actually burnt, and only some escaped to bring the doleful tidings!" The bells were rung backwards, women shrieked, candles were placed in the windows, armed horsemen rode in the direction where the destroyers were expected; and men with their wives and children, leaving all behind, even money and plate upon the tables, ran for shelter to barns and haystacks. The terror was so great that nothing like it had occurred since the Civil Wars; but the immediate cause of it all turned out to be the shouting of a few drunken people. Again came the cry of "Fire!"

\* "Tour through Great Britain," II. 64-70.

fire! Horse and arms! for God's sake!" simply because beacons were burning over the town of Halifax. Whether deluded, or wishing to keep up an excitement for political purposes, military expresses brought pretended advice "that the Irish were broken into parties and dispersed." The whole was managed so artfully, that one who inquired into the matter could not learn who contrived it.\* Father Con, an active Jesuit in London, wrote a letter to the provincial of his order at Rome, telling a story, in which he ascribes a considerable share in the catastrophe, to his own party, and especially to D'Adda, the Papal Nuncio. The mischief, he said, came from their own avarice and ambition. The King had "made use of fools, knaves, and blockheads," and the favoured agent, instead of being a "moderate, discreet, and sagacious minister," was a "mere boy, a fine, showy fop, to make love to the ladies."†

James, after a short detention at Sheerness, returned to London. Lord Middleton heard of his coming, and hurriedly scrawled a note in these words: "The King will be at Rochester this night, and intends to be at Whitehall to-morrow; has ordered his coaches to meet him at his lodgings." Immediately from Westminster, under date "Dec. 15, 1688, 7 at night," the Bishop of Winchester wrote to Sancroft, "May it please your Grace—and I am sure it will—His Majesty will be here to-morrow, and his coaches and guard are to meet him at Dartford. This account and orders came from my Lord Middleton."‡ The discarded Monarch came,

\* Thoresby's "Diary," I. 188-191.

† Clarendon's "Diary and Correspondence," II. 506.

‡ These notes are preserved amongst the "Tanner MSS.," XXVIII. 285, 286.

as Middleton said, and a gleam of loyalty burst out once more, amidst bells and bonfires. The poor man almost thought he should gain a new lease of power, and the frightened Papists came out of holes and corners to welcome their friend. He even ventured to assume a rather haughty tone, but in vain. The Dutch Ambassador informed him that the Prince would allow no Royal guards, but such as were under his own command. William was in a position to insist upon it. Three Dutch battalions reached Whitehall at 10 o'clock on the night of December the 17th. Before morning a message arrived from the Prince, requiring James to proceed to Ham, near Richmond. James said he should prefer Rochester. It mattered little where he went. The party in the ascendant only wished to get rid of him. He went to Rochester. There we need not follow him. It is enough to notice that several Bishops concurred in entreating him not to leave the country.\* From Rochester he stole away to France. Next we find him at St. Germain's.

As the King slipped down the Thames, his destined successor was preparing to take up his quarters at St. James's Palace. He disappointed the people, who waited in the rain to welcome him, by driving through the park. Attended by a brilliant train of courtiers and officers, he reached the gateway of the Royal residence late in the afternoon. The Princess Anne, accompanied by Lady Churchill, both covered with orange ribbons, went that night to the theatre in her father's coach. William had ordered Burnet to secure the Papists from violence, thinking perhaps of the

\* Dalrymple, I. 248. "Memoirs of James II." II., 270.

probable consequences of the third Declaration. He renewed the order after he had entered London; in consequence of it, passports were granted to priests wishing to leave the country, and two being imprisoned in Newgate, the busy ecclesiastic paid them a visit, and took upon himself to provide for their comfort. A little incident, recorded by Dr. Patrick, brings before us vividly the excitement amongst Churchmen at this critical period. "It was a very rainy night when Dr. Tenison and I being together, and discoursing in my parlour, in the little cloisters in Westminster, one knocked hard at the door. It being opened, in came the Bishop of St. Asaph; to whom I said, 'What makes your Lordship come abroad in such weather, when the rain pours down as if heaven and earth would come together?' To which he answered, 'He had been at Lambeth, and was sent by the Bishops to wait upon the Prince, and know when they might all come and pay their duty to him.' I asked if my Lord of Canterbury had agreed to it, together with the rest. He said, 'Yea, he made some difficulty at the first, but consented at the last, and ordered him to go with that message.'"\*

Whitehall, which, up to the flight of James, had been crowded by friends or time-servers, now became a desert; and St. James's, which had been a desert, now became a rendezvous for courtiers of every kind. Those who held staves, keys, or other badges of office, laid them down; and the whole herd of seekers, expectants, and claimants jostled one another on the threshold of the house where the new master of England

\* Account of the Life of Symon Patrick, "Works," IX. 514. The Dean says it was the 17th, but this is incorrect, it must have been the 18th.

had taken up his abode. Clarendon went to Court instantly, but could not get near His Highness for the crowd of people. A clerical address appears to have been amongst the first, if not the very first, presented to him on his arrival. At noon, after the rainy night when the Bishop of St. Asaph knocked at a door in the little cloisters at Westminster, Dr. Paman, a domestic of the Archbishop of Canterbury, called on Dr. Patrick to inform him that the Prince had appointed three o'clock in the afternoon to receive the Bishops. "Will my Lord of Canterbury be with them?" asked Patrick. "Yes, yes," was the reply. Whether an interview between the Prince and any Bishops did take place that day, or the messenger had mistaken the time, or the appointment had been altered, certain it is that the Archbishop did not go, and we have no particular account of the presentation of an address before the 21st.

On that occasion, Compton, Bishop of London, took the lead. Two days before, he and some of his clergy met to agree upon an address. There were present persons who desired the insertion of a passage to the effect that the Prince should "have respect to the King, and preserve the Church established by law;" and "one of considerable note refused to go, because these clauses were not inserted." Certain Nonconformists heard what was going on, and requested they might unite with their Episcopal brethren. Compton complied, and on Friday morning, the 21st, when the address was to be presented, sixteen early risers left their homes and threaded their way through the dusky streets. "No more could be got together in due time that morning, for the Bishop was to make the address about 9 or 10 o'clock that day." They deputed Howe,

Fairclough, Stancliffe, and Mayo “to go with the conformable clergy (who numbered about 99) and the Bishop of London to attend the Prince.” Admitted to His Highness’s presence, the Bishop conducted the interview, addressing him *vix a voce*, and gratifying the Nonconformists by a special reference to them as brethren who differed on some minor matters, but who fully concurred in the address presented, “at which words, the Prince took particular notice of the four Nonconformist ministers.”

A large meeting of Presbyterian and Independent brethren was held just afterwards, to depute four of their number to wait on Compton, to thank him for his courtesy, and whilst they were considering this matter, “there were divers bundles of the King’s letters, containing the reasons of his withdrawing, delivered or thrown in amongst them by a stranger.” The circumstance indicates the activity of James’ agents, and their idea that he had special claims on the Dissenters, who had taken advantage of his Indulgences. But, says the person who records the incident, “they are the more fortified hereby in their purpose, that they may cast off the imputation cast upon them by their enemies, as betrayers of the religion and laws of the kingdom, by complying with the Court.”\* Other Nonconformists, who did not hear of the Bishops’ audience in sufficient time, presented a distinct address to William a few days afterwards, promising “the utmost endeavour, which in their stations they were capable of affording, for the promoting the excellent

\* This account is taken from a Diary in what is called the “Historical Register Entring Book,” Vol. II. 383. “Morice MSS.,” Dr. Williams’ Library.

and most desirable ends for which His Highness had declared."\*

\* Ralph, I. 1073. There is in the "Report of the Historical MSS. Commission," Vol. II. 203, the copy of a curious paper by Rose, Bishop of Edinburgh, who relates a conversation he had with the Bishop of London, who promised in the Prince's name that he would support Episcopacy in Scotland, if the Episcopalians there would support him. The whole story is suspicious.

## CHAPTER II.

ENGLAND was now in the midst of a revolution. What was its character? Its ecclesiastical aspects alone demand our attention, but these are closely connected with others. Politics and religion were inextricably interwoven. The two great political Revolutions of England in the 17th century sprung from religious feeling, antipathies, and aspirations. Religion was the prime mover in the events of 1688. When moving in one direction the Popery of James prompted him to play the despot, and when moving in another direction the Protestantism of his subjects impelled them to fight for their liberties ; the two forces came in contact, and issued in a crash, bringing about the King's downfall and the Prince's elevation. The same influences led to a settlement of the long-debated question of prerogative, they consolidated the power of Parliament, they created the Bill of Rights.

The Peers met in their own House on the 22nd of December. Nothing of moment passed. The day before Christmas-day they met again, and we find Clarendon, with a lingering regard for the Stuart family, asking for an inquiry into the birth of the Prince of Wales, when Lord Wharton, an old Puritan, indignantly replied, "My Lords, I did not expect, at

this time of day, to hear anybody mention that child, who was called the Prince of Wales ; indeed I did not, and I hope we shall hear no more of him." It was at last decided that an address should be presented to the Prince of Orange to take on him the Administration of affairs, and to issue circular-letters to the counties, cities, universities, and cinque-ports, to send Representatives to a Convention at Westminster on the 22nd of January following.\* The Archbishop did not attend. Clarendon and the Bishop of Ely sent for him, "but the King's being gone had cast such a damp upon him that he would not come."† James, soon after his flight, had written to the Primate, informing him that, but for his hasty departure, he should have explained the reasons of his becoming a Roman Catholic ; that although he had not thought proper to do this on a former occasion, when his re-conversion had been attempted, yet he never refused speaking freely with Protestants, especially with His Grace, "whom he always considered to be his friend, and for whom he had a great esteem."‡

Clarendon busied himself in interviews with the Prelates, and we find that on the 29th of December, he and the Bishops of St. Asaph and Ely were together reading over the King's reasons for leaving Rochester. On New Year's Day, 1689, amidst a hard frost, his lingering loyalty to James did not prevent his paying court to William ; and afterwards visiting Sir Edward Seymour, he heard him say, amongst other things, the countenance shown by the Prince to Dissenters "gave too much cause of jealousy to the Church of England,"

\* "Diary and Correspondence," II. 235.

† *Ibid.*, II. 234.

‡ "Stuart Papers," quoted in D'Oyley, I. 410.

and if that Church were not supported, England would “run into a Commonwealth, and all would be ruined.”\*

All Protestants, high and low, had united for some months in the desire for a Revolution. But what exactly was the Revolution to be? As to this pressing subject, opinions ran in divergent lines. The Archbishop, suffering from ill-health, and worried by distractions, shut himself up that cold Christmas-time, and covered, with his own neat hand, twenty-five pages, from which we learn how he looked at the politics of the hour. We see him, with his simple, honest face, and a close black cap, such as gives the wearer a Puritan look, but for a pair of lawn sleeves sometimes worn, putting down the *pros* and *cons* of the great puzzle. The King is gone. A foreign captain is at the head of affairs. How is the Government to be settled? Shall the new commander be declared King? Shall the next heir, the Princess Mary (the Prince of Wales is not mentioned), be Queen, her husband acquiring an interest in the government through her right? or shall the King be declared incapable of personal government, the commander being made *Custos Regni*, who shall administer affairs in the King’s name? “I am clearly of opinion,” writes the perplexed critic, “that the last way is the best, and that a settlement cannot be made so justifiable and lasting any other way.”† But for the theory of the divine right of kings, and the subject’s duty of passive obedience, it would be impossible to conceive how a person of ordinary intelligence could advocate such a scheme. While professedly concocted for the purpose of maintaining James’ kingly rights, it stripped

\* “Diary and Correspondence,” II. 238.

† D’Oyley’s “Life of Sancroft,” I. 415.

him of all power; and curiously enough, it is open to objections such as had been brought against the Commonwealth's-men, who administered government against the King in the King's own name. What makes Sancroft's conduct the more inconsistent is, that he and his party supported the law, which required the Clergy to abhor that traitorous position of taking arms by the King's authority against the King's person. Must not William have done this, if Sancroft's advice had been adopted?

The Archbishop anxiously consulted with some of the Bishops touching this subject, and when the meetings became publicly known, they received the name of the Lambeth, or Holy Jacobite Club.\* Four of them went home one day from Lambeth, in Turner's coach, deplored they should disagree in anything, and especially in such a thing as that which all the world would notice. Turner wrote immediately afterwards to the Primate, asking him to draw up propositions against deposition and election, or anything else which would break the succession. Ken, he said, had left a draft with him, which might facilitate the task. The afternoon of the same day, Turner was to hold a meeting in Ely House, at which Patrick, Tenison, Sherlock, Scott, and Burnet were to be present, as well as two Bishops, St. Asaph and Peterborough. These men were of diverse opinions; how they got on together we do not know, but it appears some under-

\* "It is most certain that in the Palace of Lambeth, there were meetings of the Bishops and several of the Clergy, both before and after the Archbishop's suspension, frequently held; so as they were even publicly taken notice of by their enemies, who, in derision, were wont to call them the Lambeth Club, and the Holy Jacobite Club." ("Lansd. MSS., Kennet's Coll.," 987, 151.)

hand work occurred in reference to James on the part of the Bishop of Ely. He enclosed, in his letter to Lambeth, a paper to be kept very private, of which he says, it "may be published one day, to show we have not been wanting faithfully to serve a hard master in his extremity; and for the present it will be proof enough to your Grace, that although I have made some steps, which you could not, towards our new masters, I did it purely to serve our old one, and preserve the public."\*

Clarendon and Evelyn met at Lambeth Palace the Bishops of St. Asaph, Ely, Bath and Wells, Peterborough, and Chichester. They prayed, dined, and discoursed together. Outside, some persons were disposed to have the Princess proclaimed Queen without hesitation, others inclined to a Regency, a Tory party wished to invite the King back upon certain conditions, Republicans preferred to have the Prince of Orange constituted an English Stadholder, and the Popish party aimed at throwing the whole country into confusion. Evelyn records that the Bishops were unanimous for a Regency, and for suffering public matters to proceed in the name of the King.† Such unanimity, however, as Evelyn supposed, could not have existed if Clarendon be right, who says he feared the Bishop of St. Asaph had been wheedled by Burnet into supporting the transfer of the Crown, and would be induced to make the King's going away a *cession*, a word Burnet fondly used.‡ The presence of the Primate at the Convention about to be held was of the first importance, and Clarendon earnestly urged his

\* D'Oyley's "Life of Sancroft," I. 424.

† "Diary," Jan. 15, 1689.

‡ "Diary and Correspondence," II. 247.

attendance, but the obstinacy of the one equalled the importunity of the other. Sancroft would not go, nor would he visit His Highness. "Would you have me kill myself?" he petulantly asked his noble friend; "do you not see what a cold I have?" "No," said the Earl; "but it would do well if you would excuse your not waiting on the Prince, by letting him know what a cold you have, and that you will wait on him when it is gone." All the reply he could get was, "I will consider of it."\*

Whatever might be the opinions of the Lambeth party, the Bishop of London shared neither in their counsels nor in their sympathy. He wished to see the Princess Mary Queen Regnant, leaving her at liberty, if she liked, to bestow upon her husband, by consent of Parliament, the title of King. Nor did the prevalent desire of the councillors of the Archbishop, for a Regent who should rule in the King's name, satisfy all James' Anglican adherents. Sherlock, Master of the Temple, had at his back a large number of Divines, and he contended for inviting James back to Whitehall, with such stipulations as would secure the safety and peace of the realm. Burnet, on the other hand, talked of William's having acquired a right to the Crown based on conquest, a notion scouted by most Englishmen. Nine-tenths of the Clergy were for upholding the cause of hereditary monarchy, but this large majority broke up into several sections, nor did the remaining tenth part entirely agree.

Neither were Nonconformists of one mind. Some were so engrossed in the discharge of spiritual duties that they paid surprisingly little attention to the questions of the day. The biographer of Oliver Heywood

\* Patrick's "Life." "Works," IX. 515.

informs us that little remains in his papers to show what he thought of the Revolution, politically regarded. His mind rested on one point, the liberty of preaching, and it seemed indifferent to him whether it came by a Royal Declaration or by an Act of Parliament.\* Matthew Henry states that it was not without fear and trembling his father Philip received the tidings of the Prince's landing, "as being somewhat in the dark concerning the clearness of his call, and dreading what might be the consequence of it;" that he used to say, "Give peace in our time, O Lord," was a prayer to which he could add his Amen, but he stopped there. However, when the Revolution was accomplished, he rejoiced in the consequences, and joined in the national thanksgiving.† Another class of Nonconformists were in an awkward position. Their fault had been that they identified themselves with men and measures out of all harmony with their own principles. But in this emergency they presented no word of condolence to the man whom they had helped to befool, nor did they attempt anything to save him from his impending fate. A third class of Nonconformists had, without any compromise, availed themselves of the liberty offered them, though disliking the unconstitutional quarter whence it came. When the Revolution took place, most of these, and others who survived to witness it, were delighted and thankful. What John Howe did appears from what I have said already. Baxter had become too old and infirm to take any active part in public business. Fairclough, Stancliffe, and Mayo, as we have seen, joined Howe in the clerical address to William on the 21st of December, and others presented

\* Hunter's "Life of Heywood," 358.

† "Life of Philip Henry," 187.

congratulations afterwards. If Protestant Nonconformists formed a twentieth part of the population, the community to that extent may be reckoned as rejoicing in the downfall of James, probably by far the larger part supported the claims of William; yet a few old Republicans, Independent and Baptist, would, I apprehend, have preferred to see a Commonwealth, with the Prince of Orange in a presidential chair, such as the Lord Protector Cromwell had occupied.

A Convention being elected, the members met on the 22nd of January, 1689. It was composed of Protestants alone. These Protestants being chiefly Whigs, and those Whigs numbering an immense majority of Episcopilians, perhaps not more than twenty Nonconformists were returned, a fact which ought to be carefully borne in mind. The day on which the Commons assembled, the Lords also appeared, to the number of about ninety, of whom sixteen were spiritual Peers. No prayers were read; the first thing done, after a short letter from the Prince had been laid on the table, was the appointment of a day of solemn thanksgiving. Eleven Bishops were selected to draw up a form for the purpose, and it does not appear that any of them scrupled to undertake this service.\* The 30th of January fell on a Sunday; and in such a case it had been arranged that the office for Charles' martyrdom should be used on that day, and the observances of the fast transferred to the next. On the 30th, however, Evelyn notices that "in all the public offices and pulpit prayers, the collects and litany for the King and Queen were curtailed and mutilated." On the 31st the thanksgiving set aside the fast. Burnet preached before the Commons, saying,

\* Ralph, II. 28.

“ You feel a great deal, and promise a great deal more ; and you are now in the right way to it, when you come with the solemnities of thanksgiving to offer up your acknowledgments to that Fountain of Life to whom you owe this new lease of your own.”\*

The Bishop of St. Asaph, whose political sympathies have been indicated, was appointed to preach before the Lords at Westminster Abbey on the 31st, but according to Clarendon, Mr. Gee took his place.† The House of Commons, after the customary formalities, and the election of Mr. Powle as Speaker, and an expression of concurrence in the Lords’ order respecting a day of thanksgiving, proceeded, on the 28th, to debate on the state of the nation. Amidst multifarious topics, Popery, the Church, and the divine right of kings were prominent ; and the next day Colonel Birch, the Puritan, gave his view of past and present struggles by saying, “ These forty years we have been scrambling for our religion, and have saved but little of it. We have been striving against Antichrist, Popery, and Tyranny.”‡ The House voted that King James II., having endeavoured to subvert the constitution of this kingdom by breaking the original contract between King and people, and, by advice of Jesuits and other wicked persons, having violated the fundamental laws, and withdrawn himself out of the Kingdom, had abdicated the government, and that the throne was thereby vacant. The next day it was resolved that it had been found by experience to be inconsistent with the safety and welfare of this Protestant Kingdom to be governed by a Popish Prince.

\* Quoted in Lathbury’s “ Hist. of Convocation,” 317.

† “ Journals of Lords.” Compare Clarendon’s “ Diary and Correspondence,” II. 257.      ‡ “ Parl. Hist.,” V. 51.

Thanks were given to the clergymen who had assailed Popery, and had refused to read the King's Declaration.\* Things deemed necessary for better securing religious liberty and law were reported from a Committee, who particularly specified, "effectual provision to be made for the liberty of Protestants in the exercise of their religion, and for uniting all Protestants in the matter of public worship as far as may be," in which provision, are found germs of the Toleration and Comprehension Bills. The Lords at once agreed with the Commons in their vote for a Protestant succession; but about the vote declaring the throne vacant, much discussion arose. Without formally admitting that the throne was vacant—only for the present supposing it to be so—they wished to determine, first, whether supreme power for the present ought to be devolved on a Regent or on a King. This point had been keenly debated by Sancroft and his brethren. He was not present now, but they were; and in the minority of 49 for a Regency against 51 for a King, occur the names of thirteen Prelates, including the Bishop of St. Asaph, who in this matter had not been "wheeled" by Burnet, as Clarendon surmised. Indeed, the prejudice conceived against a deposing power, as a Popish art, had so impressed the minds of the Clergy, that no Bishop approved of filling the throne anew, except the Bishops of London and Bristol. The question raised in an abstract form, whether or no there was an original contract between King and people, involved a controversy touching divine right, which most of the Bishops had maintained. For the principle of a social compact, 53 Peers voted against 46, the Bishops being included amongst the latter. The idea of a contract being

\* Gutch, I. 447.

adopted, nobody could dispute that James had broken it ; but the Peers decided to substitute the words, “*deserted* the Government,” for the Commons’ phrase, “*abdicated* the Government ;” nor would the majority allow the word *vacant* to stand, inasmuch as, by a constitutional fiction, the King never dies ; and in the present case, so some contended, the Crown legitimately devolved upon the Princess of Orange—the claim of the infant Prince of Wales being given up by all parties.

A conference ensued between the Houses. The Bishop of Ely strenuously argued against using the word *abdication*, or regarding the throne as vacant ; he hoped that Lords and Commons would agree in this, not to break the line of succession, not to make the Crown elective.\* By some persons the idea was entertained of making William sole King, an idea which Burnet resisted, heart and soul, in a conversation held with Bentinck, the Prince’s principal friend.† Amidst the heat of debate, the Prince thought it time to express his sentiments. It had been proposed, he said, to settle the Government in the hands of a Regent ; that might be a wise project. It had also been suggested that the Princess should succeed to the throne, and that he, by courtesy, might share in her power. Her rights he would not oppose, her virtues he respected, but for himself, he would accept no dignity dependent upon the life of another, or on the will of a woman. Should either of the schemes be adopted, he would return to Holland, satisfied with the consciousness of having endeavoured to serve England, though in vain.‡

\* “Parl. Hist.,” V. 75. † “Own Time,” I. 818.

‡ Dalrymple, I. 269.

William's decision took effect, and the conference ended in dropping what was theoretical, and in coming to the practical resolution, that the Prince and Princess of Orange should be declared King and Queen. The Lords carried this by 62 against 47. Forty of the latter protested, amongst whom were twelve out of the seventeen Bishops present. The five who went with the majority were Compton, Lloyd of St. Asaph, Sprat, Hall, and Crew.\* Crew, the time-serving Bishop of Durham, had supported James in his obnoxious measures, had fled at the outbreak of the Revolution, had been lurking on the coast for a vessel to convey him abroad, and had returned in time to secure the advantage of supporting the new Sovereign. It has often been said that the Bishops accomplished the Revolution. No doubt the seven imprisoned in the Tower brought on the crisis which terminated in the new settlement, and so far were the authors of the change. Certain of the brethren contributed, in the way I have described, to terminate the despotism of James II., but all the seven decidedly disapproved of the Prince of Orange being constituted King, and two-thirds of the other Bishops agreed with them in this respect.

The Commons would not unite in the settlement approved by the Lords until they had carefully asserted the fundamental principles upon which they based the Revolution. The Declaration of Right, embodying these principles, having recited the unconstitutional acts of James, his endeavours to extirpate the Protestant religion, and to subvert the laws and liberties of the kingdom, goes on to state that the Prince of Orange had summoned the Convention, which Convention did now specify the ancient liberties of the English people.

\* Hallam's "Const. Hist." II. 256.

Amongst them appear the right of petition, freedom of Parliamentary debate, and the duty of the Crown frequently to call together the representatives of the people. William and Mary are then solemnly declared to be King and Queen ; the succession was determined to be in the issue of the latter ; in default of such issue, in Anne of Denmark and her heirs ; in default of her issue, then in the heirs of the King.

In this Parliamentary transaction two things appear, which have been ever kept in sight under Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman dynasties, namely hereditary right and popular election. That the crown should pass from a Monarch to one of his own blood had been a fundamental law from the beginning, modified by a choice of the people in any great crisis, when the interests of the nation have been seen to depend upon the succession of one Royal personage rather than another. In 1688, respect was paid to the ancient tradition. In the Bill of Rights the hereditary claim is distinctly set forth. But the election of William and Mary, though veiled under a reference to the throne of their ancestors, is really the point upon which their accession hinged. Mary's accession might, by those who disbelieved that the Prince of Wales was James' son, be made to depend entirely on natural descent, but the accession of William could not rest on that ground ; his election was essential to the legitimacy of his rights.

Before the completion of this Parliamentary manifesto, the Princess Mary had come to England ; and upon the 13th of February she took her place beside her husband in the Banqueting-house at Whitehall under a canopy of State, when the two Speakers, followed by the Lords and Commons respectively, were conducted into their presence by the Usher of

the Black Rod, to offer the Crown upon conditions implied in the Declaration of Rights. When the document had been read, the Prince replied, "This is certainly the greatest proof of the trust you have in us that can be given, which is the thing which makes us value it the more ; and we thankfully accept what you have offered to us. And as I had no other intention in coming hither, than to preserve your religion, laws, and liberties, so you may be sure that I shall endeavour to support them, and shall be willing to concur in anything that shall be for the good of the kingdom ; and to do all that is in my power to advance the welfare and glory of the nation." The day on which this tender was accepted, saw once more the gorgeous ceremonial by which Kings and Queens in England had been proclaimed. A long line of coaches passed from Westminster to the City, with a brilliant array of marshals' men, trumpeters, and heralds. The Lord Mayor and the Aldermen, Sheriffs, and Recorder, conducted the Peers and Commons to the middle of Cheapside, and then, after declaring that God had vouchsafed a miraculous deliverance from Popery and arbitrary power through His Highness the Prince of Orange, and after referring to the great and eminent virtue of Her Highness the Princess, whose zeal for the Protestant religion was sure to bring a blessing upon this nation, the heralds proclaimed William and Mary " King and Queen of England, France, and Ireland, with all the dominions and territories thereunto belonging."\*

That evening, the Queen sent two of her Chaplains to the Archbishop of Canterbury to beg his blessing ; and by a suspicious combination of two errands, desired

\* "Parl. Hist.," V. 111-113.

them to attend the service in Lambeth Chapel, and notice whether prayers were offered for the new Sovereigns. The Chaplain being alarmed, asked His Grace what should be done : he replied, "I have no new instructions to give." The Chaplain interpreted this as entrusting him with a discretionary power, and, wishing to keep the Primate out of difficulty, prayed for the King and Queen who had just been proclaimed. The act provoked Sancroft, who sent for the Chaplain, and commanded him either to desist from such petitions, or to cease from officiating in Lambeth.

The appointment of officers of State immediately followed the accession to the throne. William surrounded himself with Whigs and Tories. Reserving to himself the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, he appointed as President of the Council the Earl of Danby, although he had countenanced encroachments by the Royal prerogatives, and even maintained the doctrine of passive obedience. By serving under a Monarch whose throne rested on the Declaration of Rights, he virtually repudiated his earlier opinions ; yet there remained in Lord Danby an attachment to high ecclesiastical views, and he was zealous for the old connection between Church and Crown as the best method of preserving both. Halifax, described as The Trimmer, had become more of a Liberal, and to him was entrusted the Privy Seal and the Speakership of the Upper House. The Earl of Nottingham, another deserter from the Tory ranks, professed that although his principles did not allow him to take part in making William King, they bound him, now that the deed was done, to pay His Majesty a more strict obedience than he could expect from those who had made him Sovereign. He accepted the office of a Secretary of State,

an act which, like that of Danby, served to give weight to the new administration in the eyes of Tories and High Churchmen. Shrewsbury, a popular Whig, and a young man of twenty-eight, was the other Secretary. The Great Seal came into the hands of Commissioners, the chief of whom was Sir John Maynard, who had upheld the Petition of Rights in 1628, had voted with the country party in the struggles preceding the Civil Wars, had subscribed the League and Covenant, and had advised Cromwell to accept the Crown. He was ninety years of age, and when presented to William at Whitehall the Prince remarked, he must have survived all the lawyers of his time. He replied, "he had like to have outlived the law itself, if His Highness had not come over."\* The Treasury fell into the hands of Whigs, amongst whom was Godolphin, the husband of Margaret Blagge, a man of practical ability, but of no fixed principle, a staunch Churchman, yet one of a class that could live amongst Jesuits under King James, and could keep on terms with Presbyterians under King William.

This administration proceeded from a compromise which under existing circumstances seemed unavoidable. Intended to please different parties, it actually displeased them. But no appointment aroused so much criticism as the nomination of Burnet to the See of Salisbury. That See had become vacant through the death of Seth Ward; and it was the first piece of ecclesiastical preferment of which William had to dispose after his accession to the throne. To select a High Churchman would have been inconsistent and disastrous, and amongst eligible Low Churchmen, no one had such strong claims upon William as the man

\* Burnet, I. 803.

who was counsellor at the Hague, Chaplain to the Fleet, Secretary to draw up Declarations, as well as advocate of his cause in the pulpit. But the grounds upon which rested Burnet's claims made him to many the more objectionable. These grounds were political, yet though many a Bishop has been appointed for political reasons, the services now enumerated were not exactly such as to indicate qualification for spiritual overseership. At the same time it is unfair to Burnet not to say, that he was a man of piety, varied learning, large experience, and indefatigable industry. At a later period, after time had worn down the asperities of the controversy, a mitre could with much propriety have been given him ; but it was scarcely in accordance with William's policy to bestow it at once upon one who had obtrusively acted as a partisan. Many Churchmen, too, had a strong aversion to what they called his Latitudinarian and Low Church views. Consequently, a difficulty arose. The Dean and Chapter of Salisbury were as prompt to elect as the King was to nominate ; but the Archbishop of Canterbury no sooner heard of the *congré d'élire*, than he refused to engage in the requisite solemnity. Burnet goes so far as to say that Sancroft refused even to see him on the subject.\* No friendly influence could induce the Primate to swerve from his determination ; but by an evasion, such as unfortunately too often commends itself to clerical judgments, he resolved to grant a commission for others to do what he declined to do himself. The Vicar-General appeared, produced the commission, and through his officers received the usual fees. To make the matter worse, when the Archbishop's conduct was complained of by his own party,

\* "Hist. of his Own Time," II. 8.

either he, or some one in his name, contrived to abstract the document from the Registrar's office ; and it could not be recovered until after Sancroft's death, when Burnet threatened to commence legal proceedings for obtaining what was necessary to prove the validity of his consecration and his right to the Bishopric.\*

Some Churchmen soon manifested their dissatisfaction with the turn affairs had taken ; and Maynard, the first Commissioner of the Great Seal, remarked, in a debate upon making the Convention a Parliament, “There is a great danger in sending out writs at this time, if you consider what a ferment the nation is in : and I think the Clergy are out of their wits, and I believe, if the Clergy should have their wills, few or none of us should be here again.” The remark brought up Sir Thomas Clarges, who defended the Ministers in the Metropolis, and praised the Church as a bulwark during the late trials. “Clarges speaks honestly,” replied Maynard, “as I believe he thinks. As for the Clergy, I have much honour for High and Low of them ; but I must say they are in a ferment—there are pluralists among them, and when they should preach the Gospel, they preach against the Parliament and the law of England.”† At a moment when some showed dissatisfaction towards William, and the highest legal officer of the Crown thus talked about Churchmen, Lord Danby complained to His Majesty that he did all he could to encourage Presbyterians, and to dishearten Episcopalian, a circumstance which, he said, could not fail to be prejudicial to his Government and to himself.‡ It is certain that no sooner had

\* Birch's “Life of Tillotson,” 330.

† “Parl. Hist.,” V. 129–131. Feb. 20th.

‡ Ralph, II. 63.

William as King of England grasped the reins, than intrigues became rife ; thoughts arose of bringing back James, and men in office began to express a want of confidence in the New Settlement. Halifax muttered something to the effect that if the exiled King were a Protestant, he could not be kept out four months ; and Danby, that if the exile would but give satisfaction as to Religion, "it would be very hard to make head against him."\*

Still, however, a large number of Clergymen not only accepted the new order of things, but heartily espoused the cause of the new dynasty. Besides those dignitaries who assisted in raising William and Mary to the throne, many in the lower ranks, by exhortations from the pulpit, arguments from the press, and the exercise of private influence, sought to gather up popular affection, and weave it around the chosen occupants of the throne. It may be worth while to mention that Samuel Wesley, Rector of Epworth, the father of John, founder of Methodism, states that he wrote and printed the first publication which appeared in defence of the Government ; and he also composed "many little pieces more, both in prose and verse, with the same view."†

\* "Memoirs of Sir John Reresby," 398. It must be remembered that his sympathies were with James.

† Clarke's "Memoirs of the Wesley Family," I. 320.

## CHAPTER III.

IN the laws respecting oaths at the period of the Revolution, certain changes took place, which from their religious aspect demand our notice.

The new Oath of Allegiance prescribed by the Declaration of Rights differed from the old Oaths of Allegiance imposed by statute law. To make this change perfectly constitutional, and to secure entire uniformity in the expression of loyal obedience, it was necessary to pass an Act abolishing ancient forms, and determining the circumstances under which a new one should be enforced. Leave having been granted in the House of Commons upon the 25th of February to bring in such a measure, upon the 16th of March the Solicitor-General reported amendments made in the Bill, and upon the 18th of the same month the Bill passed the House. It provided that the new oaths should be taken by all persons holding office in the Church of England and the two Universities. Looking at the baronial and legislative character of Bishops, at the dependence of many Ecclesiastical preferments on the Crown, at the national character of the Universities, and at the relation of the whole body of the Established Clergy to the Government, there appears the same reason for enacting a declaration of loyalty from

them as from officers in the army and navy. The difficulty expressed by disaffected Clergymen in reference to the new oaths rested mainly on two grounds. Those of them who had already sworn allegiance to James could not reconcile it with their consciences to put aside these vows, and adopt opposite ones. But in this respect, their case was no worse than that of civilians and military men, though no appeals for their relief were ever urged. The men who showed so much sensitiveness with respect to their own oaths, were, many of them, the same persons, and all belonged to the same class, as those who had treated with contempt or indifference like difficulties on the part of Presbyterians at the time of the Restoration. Yet an Episcopalian Clergyman now had only to promise allegiance to the present occupants of the throne, without expressing any abstract opinion on the subject; whereas, a Presbyterian Clergyman had not only been required to swear allegiance to Charles II., but had been also required to declare that his previous oath was unlawful; and that the doctrine of resistance is to be held in abhorrence. At the earlier era a political dogma had been imposed as a requisite for clerical office; at the later era no political dogma was imposed at all. Another source of clerical opposition is found in the sacredness of clerical character, and the indelibility of clerical orders. Adherence to the supposed rights of the King in exile rarely existed, except in the case of High Churchmen. A belief of the Divine right of princes entwined itself round a belief in the Divine right of priests. A notion that Monarchs should be independent of Parliaments associated itself with a notion that Ministers of religion should be independent of human law. Sovereigns could not be made and

unmade by subjects, neither could Clergymen be made or unmade by States, therefore such a law as that now enacted became, in a spiritual point of view, futile, impertinent, even impious. A strange confusion of truth and error obtained throughout this reasoning. No doubt the Church, as a Divine community, is independent of human governments. But when chief Ministers of the Church are amongst chief officers of State, when Bishops are Peers, and Clergymen have legally vested rights, the case is different. Parliament had no business to alter the religious position of Ministers, but it had a right to impose conditions, for its own safety, upon those who added to the character of Ministers that of political legislators and officers of a nationally endowed Church.

A further complication of the measure arose in connection with its first appearance in the House of Commons, and was renewed in the course of its progress through the House of Lords. Upon the 25th of February, the day when leave was given to bring in the Bill for changing the oath, leave was also given to bring in a Bill for repealing the Corporation Act. The Corporation Act had been a blow aimed at Nonconformists ; now that the justice of affording them some relief was acknowledged by the Whig party, it seemed only consistent that this statute should be extinguished. Soon after the Bill was brought in, it was, through party complications, set aside, and the inconsistency arose of a Government, based upon Revolution, and therefore upon resistance, being left to enforce a principle destructive of its own authority ; the inconsistency, moreover, was associated with injustice and ingratitude towards a party zealous in its support. High Church Tories of course wished to preserve the Corporation

Act, and contributed to its preservation ; Low Church Whigs, though willing to relieve Nonconformists, still wished to keep Nonconformity in check, and manifested no zeal for the removal of an engine of intolerance, which lasted down even to our own times.

Efforts in favour of Nonconformists having thus failed in the Lower House, like movements were uselessly made in the Upper. The King, in a speech delivered on the 16th of March, emphatically recommended Parliament to provide against Papists, so as to “leave room for the admission of all Protestants that are willing and able to serve.” In these words he showed his desire for the alteration of the Test Act. The Test Act had been passed to exclude Papists from holding civil office ; and, zealous for the accomplishment of that end, Nonconformists had supported it at the sacrifice of their own interests. There were members in the House of Lords prepared to carry out the King’s wishes. They desired to render all Protestant citizens eligible to serve the State ; during the progress of the Allegiance Bill, they supported the introduction of a clause for abolishing the sacramental test. But the Tory Lords were too numerous to allow of its being passed ; and some Whig Peers, including the puritan Lord Wharton, recorded a protest against the rejection of the clause. Not discouraged by defeat, one of the Lords proposed another clause, the object of which was to render the celebration of the Lord’s Supper in a Nonconformist place of worship legally equivalent to its celebration in a parish church. This, like the former attempt, failed ; and again we find a protest recorded in the Journals, Lord Wharton being again among the protesters. The majority of the Lords, in the rejection of clauses for the partial

repeal of the Test Act, proceeded on the same line with the majority of the Commons in getting rid of the repeal of the Corporation Act. But another wish rose in the King's mind, which received support from a majority in the Upper House. It is very well known that he desired to treat the Clergy in general with great lenience, and to make as much allowance as possible for nonjuring scruples. By conceding so much to the High Church party, he aimed at reconciling them to those concessions which, on the other side, he longed to see granted to Nonconformists. He could not secure the latter concessions, but he easily secured the former. The policy of the Lords, both Whig and Tory, both Low Church and High Church, was to disown Nonconformity, and to maintain the Episcopalian Establishment ; the policy of the High Church Peers was to support those Clergymen with whom they sympathized in Ecclesiastical views, and to relieve them from the pressure of the new oaths ; and the policy of the Whig Low Church Peers was to conciliate the same party as much as possible. Even Burnet, just exalted to the Bench, took part in a debate before his consecration, advocating a mild arrangement of the matter in reference to his scrupulous brethren.\* It followed that the Bill left the Lords with a provision allowing every beneficed divine to continue in his benefice without taking the oath, unless the Government saw reason for putting his loyalty to the test. Upon this point the temper of the Lower House differed from that of the Upper. They inserted in the Bill a clause rendering it absolutely incumbent on every one holding preferment to take the oath by the 1st of August, 1689, under pain of immediate suspension—by the end of six

\* "Own Time," II. 9, 10.

months afterwards, upon pain of final deprivation.\* With that claim embodied in it, the Bill went back to the Lords. They fought for their own gentler method. Conferences were held between the Houses: compromises were suggested: reports were made: debates were renewed: but the Lords could not stand against the Commons, and the stringent method insisted upon by the latter became the law of the land.

The Whigs in the House of Commons were as zealous as the Tories in the House of Lords in maintaining the Church of England, but they were utterly averse to the politics of that party, which the project of William, supported by the Peers, sought to win over by conciliation. They could not favour High Church views, they had no notion of the Church being independent of the State. If the Clergy received honours and emoluments from the Civil power, then to the Civil power they must, like other subjects, yield obedience. The spirit of the House was Erastian; and no doubt passion mingled with principle, resentment with the maintenance of supremacy.

The Oath of Allegiance had at an early period been readily taken by the Commons, only two of them refusing to swear. In the other House a vast majority of the lay and spiritual Lords had complied with the law, but certain Bishops had been incapacitated, or were reluctant in compliance; others altogether refused to submit to authority. In the Journal of the Lords for the 18th of March, amongst notices of absence, we find the Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield described as "ill of the strangury and the stone;" the Bishop of Worcester as "weak in body," and very aged; and the Bishop of St. David's as writing a letter of excuse, not

\* "Commons' Journals," April 13th.

at all satisfactory. This last Prelate, who had for some time been mistrusted by his brethren, consulted Sir John Reresby, who told him to fall back on his own conscience. The next day the Bishop took the oath.\* But the Primate and his brethren of Chichester, of Ely, of Norwich, of Bath and Wells, of Gloucester, of Peterborough, and of Worcester refused, and came forward as vanguard to the body of which I shall have more to say hereafter. The oath was taken by the Clergy in various ways. Some, who objected to its being imposed, felt they could adopt it conscientiously. Some questioned the lawfulness of it, and did not blame the Nonjurors, but themselves took the benefit of the doubt. Some swore with a certain reserve, expressing the sense in which they explained the obligation with "an implicit relaxation" of the meaning of the words. Others, at a loss to determine the point, yielded to the opinions of lawyers and divines.†

The Coronation Oath came under consideration at the same time as the Oath of Allegiance, and, like it, occasioned great discussion. The oath pledged the Sovereign to preserve the Church "as it is now established by law;" and the Commons were thereby led to inquire into the exact meaning of the words. Some, who longed for an alteration in the formularies, were anxious that, instead of the words "Church as it is now established by law," should be the words, "Church as it is, or *shall be*, established by law," thus expressly providing for new arrangements. It was contended that Church doors ought to be made wider, and that in anticipation of this, the proposed alteration of the oath should be accomplished. Some urged no wish for change in doctrines, but only for change in cere-

\* Reresby, 401. March 28th. † "Life of Kettlewell," 217, 218.

monies, and they felt unwilling that the oath should preclude the latter. Moreover, they desired to prevent any taunt from foreign Protestants to the effect that Parliament had made the Church unalterable. It was replied that the omission of such words would not be a bar to reform, that Parliament had power to alter laws, that, consistently with the maintenance of Protestant doctrine, there might be the relaxation of forms, and that tender consciences could be brought in at the door without pulling down rafters to let them through the roof. Though a rider to the effect, that no clause in the Act should prevent the Sovereign from giving assent to a Bill for Church Reform was not formally adopted, it was clearly understood that the oath did not fetter the Sovereign in any act of legislative concurrence, but only bound him in his executive capacity ; the original words therefore were sanctioned by a majority of 188 against 149.\*

The Coronation, for which this oath prepared, took place on the 11th of April, when both political parties in unequal proportions participated in the solemnities. Tory and Jacobite Lords, who had voted for a Regency, increased the magnificence, one carrying the crown of the King, another the crown of the Queen, and a third the sword of Justice ; whilst a fourth rode up the middle of Westminster Hall, as champion for William and Mary against all comers. Noble damsels of both classes appeared in large numbers and dazzling splendour to swell the retinue, or to watch the movements of the Regnant Queen ; and amongst them walked the pretty little Lady Henrietta, daughter of the Earl of Rochester, who had persistently opposed the idea that the throne was vacated by the departure

\* "Parl. Hist.," V. 199-206.

of James. The nonjuring Prelates would take no part in the ceremonies ; the absence of the Primate was a serious circumstance, but, by a clause in the Coronation Act, the King had authority to chose some other Bishop for the principal ceremony of the day. Accordingly he chose Compton, Bishop of London, to place the crown upon his head. This Low Churchman and staunch Revolutionist was accompanied by Prelates of different characters : Lloyd of St. Asaph, one of the seven who had been sent to the Tower, walked on the one hand, holding the paten ; Sprat of Rochester, who had been a member of the High Commission, walked on the other, carrying the chalice ; and Burnet of Salisbury ascended the pulpit to deliver a sermon, of which the peroration, imploring the blessing of Heaven on the King and Queen in this life, and bestowment upon them in the life to come of crowns more enduring than those on the altar, excited a hum of applause from the Commons, who were seated behind it. For the first time the Coronation occurred neither on a Sunday nor a holiday ; and for the first time really in accordance with a precedent set at Cromwell's installation, a Bible was presented to the Sovereigns as "the most valuable thing that this world contains ;" and it would appear that the identical volume still exists, for one of the treasures of the Royal Library at the Hague is a Bible, inscribed with these words : "This Book was given the King and I at our Crownation. Marie R." The event was celebrated in the provinces ; garlands adorned with oranges were carried about the streets of country towns, amidst the beating of drums, the pealing of bells, and the huzzas of the people, followed at night by the blazing of bonfires.\*

\* Macaulay, IV. 121. Stanley's "Memorials of Westminster  
VOL. V.

At the time when the Allegiance and Coronation Oaths were under discussion, two other important subjects, immediately connected with Ecclesiastical History, occupied Parliamentary attention. The one was the widening of admission into the Church, the other was the concession to Dissenters of liberty to worship according to conviction : both measures had been repeatedly taken up and repeatedly laid down during the reign of Charles II.

The steps in reference to Comprehension may be conveniently considered first. The Primate Sancroft, it is alleged, looked favourably in that direction, amidst the excitement to liberal feeling, which sprung up on the eve of the Revolution : certainly at the beginning of the year 1689, Lloyd, Tillotson, Sharp, and Tenison met at the house of Stillingfleet, as we are informed by Patrick, who was present on the occasion, to consult about concessions to Dissenters. "We agreed that a Bill should be prepared, to be offered by the Bishops, and we drew up the matter of it in ten or eleven heads."\* Coincident with the time when such proposals were matured, but not coincident with the particular method which these and other Divines had in view, was the publication of a draft, by some irresponsible person, for the bringing of all parties into communion with the Established Church. This scheme soon dropped into the limbo of quixotic plans, but it made some noise at the time, and is sufficiently curious to be worth a few words.

Amidst existing religious differences the principle is laid down that as there is one Catholic Church under

Abbey," etc., 94, and Buxton's "Diary" in Dale's "Annals of Coggleshall," 270.

\* "Autobiography," 516.

Christ, so there must be many local Churches framed after some type of political organization. The Church of England is of the latter kind, placed under the government of King and Bishops. This Church requires a change. It wants comprehensiveness. Now, a distinction exists between tolerable and intolerable religions. Intolerable religions are set aside, but all tolerable religions ought not only to be legalized, but incorporated in the Establishment. Bishops should be King's officers, to act *circa sacra*; and those now called Dissenters should be eligible for such an office, with power to supervise all parties, in order to the keeping of them in harmony with their own principles, yet so as not to disturb the peace of others.\* This scheme included a provision that Ecclesiastical laws should be enacted by a Convocation, including non-episcopal members, or by the two Houses of Parliament.

A Bill "for uniting their Majesties' Protestant subjects" was introduced in the House of Lords by the Earl of Nottingham on the 11th of March, and that day received its first reading. Upon the 14th it was read a second time and committed; and at the same sitting there was introduced by the same nobleman, and entrusted to the same Committee, another Bill, entitled, "An Act for exempting their Majesties' Protestant subjects, dissenting from the Church of England, from the penalties of certain laws." Two measures, connected with each other, were thus launched side by side, destined to meet different fates. Debated by the Lords with considerable sharpness, the Bill for uniting Protestants was narrowly watched by people outside, of different sentiments; and when no regular system existed for reporting speeches, fragments of senatorial

\* Somers' "Tracts" (old edition), I. 380.

oratory were casually picked up and preserved from oblivion by diarists and others ; a person who looked at the subject from a dissenting point of view informs us that the Bill was not thought "large enough to comprehend the sober sort of Dissenters, for it did not grant to them some of the great points they had always and still did insist upon ;" and that the Marquis of Winchester, fervent for Comprehension, as conducive to the interest of the Church, was unconcerned about an Act of Indulgence, since "that," he said, "would but nourish Church snakes and vipers in the bosom of the Church."\*

Early in the month of April we find the Lords busy with the Comprehension Bill : "Whether to agree with the Committee in leaving out the clause about the indifferency of the posture at the receiving the Sacrament ?" It occasioned a vehement debate, but it was carried. Burnet, according to his own account, supporting it with great zeal.† Another debate arose. It being proposed that a Commission should be appointed, including laymen and clergymen, to prepare a plan for healing divisions, Burnet adopted the questionable policy of striving to persuade opponents by humouring their prejudice—a policy of which he afterwards repented. He argued against the proposed Commission, and upon the question being put, there was an equality of votes. A negative being put on the proposition, certain Lords entered a protest, one of them on the ground that to exclude laymen from such a business was opposed to statutes of Parliament in the reigns of Henry VIII. and Edward VI., which

\* March 23rd, "MSS. Journal" ("Historical Register, Entering Book," II.). Dr. Williams' Library.

† "Own Time," II. 10.

appointed a mixed Commission to revise the Canon law.

The Comprehension Bill, with the modifications just noticed, passed the Lords, and was sent down to the Commons. Strange again, and the fact has been overlooked by our principal modern historians, before the Lords' Bill reached the Commons, the Commons were engaged upon a Comprehension Bill of their own, and upon a Toleration Bill likewise. The day which saw the Lords reading the former of these for the third time, saw the Commons also reading a similar one of their own for the first time, and granting leave to bring in another Bill, as the phrase went, for "easing of Protestant Dissenters." But the party in the Commons earnest for Comprehension, had to row against wind and tide. One member desired the new Bill might be adjourned for a fortnight; another wished to put it off till Doomsday. Old Colonel Birch impugned the motives of those who opposed the measure by mentioning the names of two members in the last Long Parliament, who had objected to a similar proposal, and who proved afterwards to be Papists in disguise.

Whilst the two Bills for Comprehension were on the table, the Commons concurred with the Lords in an address expressing gratitude for His Majesty's repeated assurances to maintain the Church of England, and praying that he would continue care for its preservation; and that, according to ancient practice, he would issue writs as soon as convenient for calling a Convocation, for the consideration of Ecclesiastical matters. This address foreclosed the possibility of doing any more at present in reference to Comprehension; the measure was shelved, and debates respecting it were dropped.

At whose door lay the responsibility of defeating this attempt at solving a long-agitated question? The responsibility must be divided. It is difficult to get at a complete knowledge of the views and aims of different parties interested in the subject. A spirit of intrigue, a habit of insincerity, and the employment of double-dealing, which cast clouds around what was in many respects a “glorious Revolution,” influenced those who took part in the proceeding. Credit may be given to Compton, Burnet, and others, for an honest intention to promote union; but I am at a loss to understand the Earl of Nottingham, who introduced the Bill to the Lords, and who, being a High Churchman, must, one would suppose, have been inimical to at least some of its provisions. Still more difficult is it to understand the conduct of certain nonjuring Bishops, who, before they withdrew from the House, moved in favour of a comprehension, as well as the connivance of Sancroft, in allowing his name to be mentioned in connection with it. Reresby says some of the Prelates who supported the Bill did so more from fear than inclination;\* and Burnet declares, “those who had moved for this Bill, and afterwards brought it into the House, acted a very disingenuous part; for while they studied to recommend themselves by this show of moderation, they set on their friends to oppose it; and such as were very sincerely and cordially for it, were represented as the enemies of the Church, who intended to subvert it.”† As to the Nonjurors, it was believed at the time that they would not have been dissatisfied if any innovation upon ecclesiastical forms, or any encroachment on clerical authority, had furnished a pretext for dividing the Church; this belief, however,

\* Reresby, 390.

† Burnet, II. 11.

was indignantly denounced as utterly false by one of the Nonjurors.\* The whole atmosphere seems to have been laden with duplicity; and when the measure came down to the Lower House, with the apparent sanction of the Upper, there is reason to believe that if not the parents, yet the nurses and sponsors of the Bill had no objection to have the child killed in its cradle. Some, charged with this kind of infidelity, excused themselves on the ground of what they called the manifest partiality shown by certain of the Court Lords to the Dissenters.†

Objections offered by some of the Lords related to the details, not to the principle of the Bill, and no formal opposition seems to have been made to it by the Commons. They had appeared at first friendly enough to the general measure, and when they abandoned it, they did so under cover of desiring a meeting of Convocation, which might efficiently deal with the subject. The hapless infant died from neglect rather than violence; not through the blows of an open enemy, but for want of nursing on the part of those who were pledged to cherish it.

The treachery, or apathy, of the Commons can be accounted for when we remember the character of the House and the circumstances of the times: as we have seen, but few Nonconformists, not more than twenty or thirty Presbyterians, could be counted among the members. The vast majority were Churchmen, some, Tory Churchmen, looking with a sinister eye upon the whole affair, some, Whig Churchmen, liberal in a limited degree, but opposed to the principle of Dissent: they

\* Somerville's "Political Transactions," 275; Smith's remarks —Lathbury's "Nonjurors," 158.

† Ralph, II. 73.

cared much more for the Episcopalian Establishment than for what was called the Protestant Religion, they had little or no sympathy with the religious sentiments of the Nonconformists, they were unable to enter into their scruples, they were afraid that concession might endanger their own community, and they looked with apprehension upon the nonjuring movement. Much mischief was apprehended from that quarter, should alterations be made countenancing the idea that the Establishment under William and Mary gave up Episcopalian distinctions. The idea would strengthen the counter schism, for Nonjurors might be expected to make capital out of the circumstance, and claim honour for maintaining Episcopalianism in its integrity. Another circumstance doubtless contributed to the turn affairs took in the Lower House.

Dissenters were not of one mind. Philip Henry earnestly desired Comprehension, “for never,” says his son, “was any more averse to that which looked like a separation than he was, if he could possibly have helped it—*salvâ conscientiâ*. His prayers were constant, and his endeavours, as he had opportunity, that there might be some healing methods found out and agreed upon.”\* It would also have delighted Richard Baxter in his last days to see the door opened as wide as he had long desired. Bates would have been pleased. The same may be said of Howe. But many were of a different mind. The Nonconformist advocates of Comprehension belonged chiefly to the Presbyterian Church. Almost all Independents and Baptists felt it impossible for any alterations to be made such as could allow of their becoming parochial incumbents. More than a few had long been voluntaries, numbers were beginning

\* “Life,” by Matthew Henry, 181.

to look in a direction opposite to that of an Establishment. Selfishness has been assigned as a motive. "Some few pastors of wealthy congregations might be tempted to desire a continuance of the distance between Dissenters and Churchmen." Yet Churchmen entertained "more charitable thoughts of sincere Dissenters." The balance of temporal advantages certainly inclined on the side of a nationally endowed Church, rich in tithes and other revenues, richer still in rank and prestige. However, it is unfair to suppose that, except in very rare instances indeed, an eye to income retained men in Nonconformist positions. Beyond all doubt, had Dissenting ministers been generally zealous in supporting the measure, they would have been charged by their neighbours with looking after the loaves and fishes. Where, however, no worldly love determined the decision, it might be influenced by prejudice and suspicion; for persons must have been more or less than human, who, looking at their treatment for thirty years, could be free from passionate emotion in estimating those who had been either bitter persecutors or the unconcerned witnesses of perpetuated wrong. Churchmen's motives at the Revolution would not always be fairly weighed, and where no sufficient ground existed for imputing dishonourable intentions to Churchmen, Nonconformists might suspect no warm welcome would be afforded them in the Establishment, even if the iron gates should unfold. When reports of Comprehension were rife at the earlier period, a story had been told to this effect: Sancho the Third, King of Spain, put aside his brother's children that he might ascend the throne; a lady who represented the dispossessed line of Princes married the Duke of Medina Celi, who assumed the rights of his wife. He and his

descendants accordingly petitioned the Sovereign to restore the crown, to which the latter replied, "*No es lugar*," "There is no room." The story had been applied by Presbyterians to the abeyance in which their claims had been held for more than a quarter of a century. "So our just liberty is talked of," says Newcome, of Manchester, "by fits in course ; and in course doft off with *No es lugar*, There is no room."\* It was thought the story remained as applicable after the Revolution as before.

This fact should be remembered. Comprehension became to all parties more and more difficult, and to some parties less and less desirable, as time rolled on. However hard it might be to effect a reconciliation, looking at the temper of Churchmen in 1662, it became harder in 1689, looking at the position of Dissenters. They had increased in numbers, had formed themselves into distinct Churches, had obtained their own ordained ministers, and had begun to create an ecclesiastical history, and to cherish in their separate capacity something of an *esprit de corps*. The opportunity of reclaiming the wanderers, once possessed by the Church party, had slipped away beyond recall. Overtures, which would have been eagerly grasped before, were coldly looked at now.†

The history of the measures for *easing* or *indulging* Dissenters presents a marked contrast to the history of the measure for uniting them to the Establishment. The Bill ordered on the 8th of April by the House of Commons to be drawn up for the former purpose, was

\* Hunter's "Life of Heywood," 200.

† There are entries in the "Hist. Register," Williams' MSS., relative to conversations on the subject between the King and John Howe, June 12th and 22nd.

read on the 15th. The Bill from the Lords' House, where it had smoothly passed, was received on the 18th, and first read on the 20th of the same month. Both Bills were committed on the 15th of May. What little of the debate has been preserved shows it to have been brief, desultory, and superficial—not dealing with any great principles, but only discussing details, with an outburst now and then of ill-temper. One speaker would not give indulgence to Quakers, because they would not take an oath. Another identified them with Penn, and looked upon them as Papists in disguise. Yet all the speakers supported more or less the principle of the Bill, although some were of opinion that it should be adopted as an experiment for seven years.\* It speedily passed without any such limitation, and received the Royal assent on the 24th of May.

The cause of this great and successful measure lay in a deeper region than that of political intrigue and party faction. Powerful and telling arguments had long been pressed upon the abettors of intolerance; and the impiety, the injustice, the absurdity, and the uselessness of attempting to coerce the conscience, had been demonstrated hundreds of times on grounds of Religion, Reason, and History. No class of writers had performed this important service so fully as certain Baptists and Independents, whom we have had occasion to notice. They had contended against intolerant laws, not in the spirit of indifference, not because religion

\* "Parl. Hist." V. 263. It is greatly to be lamented that the debates on many important questions of the period are totally lost, and those reported are given in such a confused state as to be in some cases unintelligible. Such is the case with the debates here noticed. Reporters were proscribed. In 1694 a news-letter writer, named Dyer, was summoned by the House of Commons, and reprimanded for reporting their proceedings.

was to them a matter of trivial or secondary importance, but because it was to them all in all, and they shuddered to see its name tainted by an alliance with despotic principles. Although their pleas and appeals did not perhaps to any appreciable extent directly affect public opinion, yet they secretly leavened the minds of religious people, and prepared for the coming change.

The doctrine of Toleration has of late been described as the offspring of scepticism. What kind of scepticism? If it mean scepticism or unbelief as to the obligation to punish men for opinions, or as to the moral criminality of errors purely intellectual, or as to the wisdom of vesting political power in ecclesiastical persons—to say that this lies at the basis of Toleration is simply to repeat an identical proposition. But if it mean doubt or disbelief as to religion in general, or Christianity in particular, then to say Toleration arose from that cause in this country is simply untrue. Herbert and Hobbes, according to such a theory, ought to have been the apostles of freedom; but they were not. Baptists, Independents, and Quakers, according to such a theory ought not to have been the apostles of freedom; yet they were. The same thing may be said of Jeremy Taylor and John Locke. Whilst, however, the chief advocates of Toleration were religious men, it is not to be denied that the measure when carried was the work of the State rather than of the Church. The Liberal Bishops supported it; but the great body of Churchmen were averse to its provisions. With regard to a number of the clergy and the laity, the State came forward as a constable to keep the peace between them and their Nonconformist fellow-citizens, whose rights they had violated. Books and pamphlets were not the

only nor the main agencies which brought about the Religious Revolution of 1689. It is remarkable, that the first of Locke's famous letters on Toleration was printed in Holland, in the Latin language, in the year 1689, and was not translated into English and circulated in this country in time to assist in the passing of the Toleration Bill. It threw into form, and it made plain to the common sense of humanity, those sentiments which were almost universal amongst the Dutch, and were beginning to be common amongst the English. It rather justified what was being done at the time by the Legislature, than prompted or supported the Legislature in its career. It formulated the reasons of a conclusion at the moment practically reached ; it expounded principles just being embodied in an Act of Parliament. John Locke brought out the philosophy of Toleration. Toleration had become the genius of his character. Men whose minds have many sides, and who, from large human sympathies, tolerate those who differ from them, are made what they are by wide intercourse with the world. Born of Puritan parents, educated at Oxford under Dr. Owen, attached to the preaching of Whichcote, intimate with Cudworth's family, connected with Lord Shaftesbury, friendly with Le Clerc, Limborch, and other Divines of the Remonstrant school, Locke caught and, in the advocacy of Toleration, reflected influences emanating from diversified sources. Reduced to a simple formula, the basis of his scheme was this : The State and the Church are essentially distinct. The Law recognized a Jewish commonwealth ; the Gospel recognizes no Christian commonwealth. Locke repudiated all connection between the State and the Church ; but he did not repudiate all connection between the State and

Religion, for he excluded Atheists from Toleration. He also excluded Papists, not, however, on religious, but on political grounds. Locke's principle, followed out, would have made him a Dissenter ; and it is a fact that he wrote a defence of Nonconformity, which he never published. Though nominally in communion with the Establishment to the day of his death, he generally attended the ministry of a lay preacher.\* A paper by John Howe, in which he stated the case of Protestant Dissenters, came nearest, in point of time, to the position of a manifesto in advance, clearing ground for the new law. His paper was drawn up in the beginning of 1689, yet it may be doubted whether it had any wide influence in consummating the change.

Amongst the immediate causes of the Bill being passed must be numbered old promises made to Dissenters by men in power, again and again ; the pledges of political parties of all sorts, Whigs and Tories, Low Churchmen and High Churchmen, given amidst struggles against Popery in the preceding summer, all originating in religious impulses : and especially the influences of William, who honestly advocated liberty on a wide scale. Beyond this, and more effectual still, there existed a state of public feeling which, although most reasonable, had not been produced by reasoning, and, though it could be victoriously defended by argument, had not really been reached by logical formulas. It is only one of a number of instances in which a change comes over the legislative enactments of a nation through a change wrought in the minds of rulers, wrought also in the minds of a people, the *Zeit-Geist*, or spirit of the age, produced by the discipline of

\* "Life," by Lord King, 341. Preface to "Letters on Toleration," 1765.

circumstances, and by sympathetic impulses, in which pious men recognize the finger of Providence. What the Earl of Nottingham said in defence of his measure when he laid his Bill upon the table, I do not know ; but I apprehend that, as a High Churchman he must have found it difficult to show how his advocacy could be reconciled with his antecedents. He might have been unable to explain how, by reasoning, he had passed from his former to his present position. He and others might be fairly charged with inconsistency ; a suspicion of it might even now and then cross their own minds. But, like all mankind, they were the subjects of influences more powerful than syllogisms, they bent beneath a force mightier than logic. Sophistical theories ingeniously spun, fondly watched, and for a time vigilantly guarded, get blown to the winds by the breath of inexorable facts, and of the spirit which throbs at the heart of them. False systems and ideas are found to be impracticable ; as such they are given up by everybody. It is of no use to preserve them ; they must be thrown away. So with the doctrine of religious intolerance. Englishmen could endure it in its old form no longer. A new spirit had taken possession of the age, and ancient restrictions must at last be sacrificed. But for such facts, men like Leonard Busher and John Goodwin might have gone on arguing for ever in vain.

In estimating the worth of what was done at this period, it betrays a narrow philosophy to harp upon the word " Toleration " as being an offensive term. It is a curious fact that the word was not used in the Bill from beginning to end. It is entitled, " An Act for exempting their Majesties' Protestant subjects dissenting from the Church of England from the penalties of

certain laws." Why dwell upon what the measure was popularly called, the question is, What did it accomplish? Its provisions confessedly are imperfect. Restrictions inconsistent with its principle were left, reminding us, how much more certain feelings connected with certain events have to do with producing them than any abstract conceptions whatever. But the Act did this, it afforded to all Protestants, with few exceptions, a legal protection in carrying out their systems of doctrine, worship, and discipline. It threw the shield of law over every religious assembly within open doors. To interrupt the Independent, the Baptist, the Quaker, in the service of God, became a criminal offence. By shielding Dissent, the law, though of course not endowing it, might also be said, in a certain sense, to establish it. It left national emoluments to Episcopalians; but it secured as much religious freedom to other denominations as to them. Nay, it secured more, a consequence necessarily resulting from the difference in relation to the State, between voluntary Churches and one nationally endowed. By the change which the Act effected in the legal position of Nonconformity, it produced a relative change in the legal position of the Establishment. From the moment that William gave his assent to the Act, that Church ceased to be national in the sense in which it had been so before. It could no longer claim all Englishmen, as by sovereign right, worshippers within its pale; it gave legalized scope for differences of religious action.

The restrictions of the Act pressed upon two classes of religionists. It distinctly provided that the law should not be construed as giving any ease, benefit, or advantage to any Papist, or Popish recusant, whatever. It therefore left in full operation the old laws pointed

at the adherents of Rome. But not satisfied with a prohibition of Roman worship, the Government caused to be issued Royal proclamations requiring all reputed Papists to depart out of London and Westminster, and confining all Popish recusants within five miles of their respective dwellings. In connection with this fact it should be noticed, that in the month of July, the Royal assent was given to an Act which vested in the two Universities, the presentations of benefices belonging to Papists.

The other class of persons to whom liberty of worship was refused, consisted of such as denied, in preaching or writing, the doctrine of the Trinity declared in the Articles of the Church of England. But special provision was made for the relief of Quakers. Instead of being required to take any oath, they were allowed to make a declaration, first, in common with others, of their abhorrence of Papal supremacy, and next, of their own orthodoxy.

Comprehension fared differently from Toleration ; but Tillotson would not let the former drop. Nobody was more sincere and earnest about it, and the view he took of the grounds on which Christians of different opinions might be brought together, appears from a paper dated September 13, 1689. It proposes that ceremonies enjoined or recommended in the Liturgy or Canons, be left indifferent ; that the Liturgy be revised, and such alterations made as may supply the defects, and remove exceptions as far as possible ; that it be sufficient for clergymen to subscribe a general promise of submission to the doctrine, discipline, and worship of the Church of England ; that a new body of Canons be made, particularly with regard to the reformation of manners both in ministers and people ;

that there be an effectual regulation of Ecclesiastical Courts, and that the power of excommunication be taken out of the hands of lay officers, and entrusted to the Bishop; that those who have been ordained in the foreign Reformed Churches, be not required to be re-ordained; that for the future none be capable of preferment in the Church “that shall be ordained in England otherwise than by Bishops;” yet that those who have been ordained only by Presbyters be not compelled to renounce their ordination. It was proposed as sufficient for such persons to receive imposition of hands from a Bishop in this or the like form—“If thou art not already ordained, I ordain thee.” \*

Burnet, as I have noticed, thought at the end of April that to entrust Convocation with the business of Comprehension would be its ruin; Tillotson at the same time considered that ecclesiastical affairs ought to be submitted to Synodical authority, lest a handle should be offered for objecting that, as in the case of the Reformation, the change was accomplished by the State rather than the Church. The Dean, however, considered it expedient that, in the first instance, a Commission should be issued for a number of Divines, of diverse opinions, to digest a scheme for “establishing a durable peace.” † His object was good, his motives were amiable, but his method was unwise; for what chance would there be that Commissioners, in case of coming to an agreement, could induce Convocation to adopt their views? It was to renew Archbishop Williams’ Committee in 1641; it was to repeat the inconsistency of the Savoy Conference. It is true the relation between Tillotson’s Committee and the Convocation was more definite

\* Birch’s “Life of Tillotson,” 182–184.      † Ibid., 180.

than that between the two bodies in a former instance, still it was of an abnormal kind, and open to objections from ecclesiastical lawyers. Though Burnet had in April predicted the failure of the scheme, he in the course of the summer fell in with it, and the King, influenced by the Dean's persuasion and by Burnet's concurrence, issued, on the 13th of September, an instrument for bringing together ten Bishops and twenty Divines to confer upon this matter. The Commissioners on the 3rd of October met in the Jerusalem Chamber. Proceedings opened at 9 o'clock ; there were 17 of the 30 Commissioners present.\* After listening to the Commission, they discussed the question, whether the Apocrypha ought to be publicly read in Church. Beveridge contended, that dropping the old custom would give great offence to the people, and he was supported by Jane, who had a hand in drawing up the famous University decree in 1683, against seditious books and damnable doctrines. Jane recommended, that if not the whole Apocrypha, yet some of its most useful portions should be retained ; on the other hand, it was urged that not only were particular parts objectionable, but all the books were deficient in authority, and to take lessons from them was to countenance the baseless pretensions of the Church of Rome. Meggot, Dean of Winchester, wished the Commissioners to defer their decision until a larger number should meet ; to which it was replied that, inasmuch as a decision would not be binding, but would be referred to Convocation, they

\* Dr. Williams, afterwards Bishop of Chichester, kept a diary of the proceedings of the Commission, which, with a "Copy of the Alterations," is printed in a "Parliamentary Return," 1854. To this "Return" I am chiefly indebted for what follows.

might as well vote at once ; upon which the Commissioners decided against the use of Apocryphal lessons.

The Prayer-Book version of the Psalms next came under review, when Kidder, then one of the London clergy, and regarded as an authority on the subject, was appealed to by the Bishops present, and gave his opinion, that the author of the first half of the version, growing weary of his patchwork, translated the second portion afresh, greatly to the improvement of the whole, although the entire translation differed from the Septuagint, as well as from the original Hebrew. Nothing was determined. At the next sitting (October the 16th), a serious discussion arose as to the authority of the Commission itself. Sprat had been an active member of James' High Commission, and now, inconsistently enough, objected to the Low Commission appointed by William ; yet William's Commission was as constitutional as the other had been the reverse, for *this* was simply to give advice, whereas *that* claimed judicial prerogatives. After quibbles about the altered official position of some Commissioners, and the small number left at the close of the last meeting, Sprat urged the inconsistency of touching formularies to which they had given their assent, the impropriety of forestalling Convocation debates, and the probability of provoking Parliament by usurping its functions. Sprat found a supporter in Jane, "a double-faced Janus," as people called him, for, after being a staunch supporter of non-resistance, he had conveyed to the Prince of Orange the offer of the University to coin its plate in the Deliverer's service ; and next, disappointed of a mitre, had on that account (so said his enemies) abandoned liberal opinions.

Another of Sprat's allies was Aldrich,\* Dean of Christchurch, architect of the Peckwater Quadrangle, munificent in his patronage and gifts, a master of logic, a proficient in music, and generous and genial in his hospitality. But Patrick, the new Bishop of Chichester, came to the rescue, dwelling upon the difference between the two Commissions, and urging the high legal sanction of their present operations. Compton, Bishop of London, still zealous on the liberal side, told his brethren that what they were doing had received the sanction of the Lords; that if they did not execute their trust, it would be taken out of the hands of the Clergy altogether; and that discharging their duty now would facilitate the business of Convocation, in the same way as Committees helped on the work of Parliament. Already it appeared that the reverend and right reverend Commissioners were sitting on barrels of gunpowder; presently the first explosion occurred, when Lloyd, Bishop of St. Asaph, one of the most zealous advocates of Comprehension, hastily rose to move that those who were not satisfied with the Commission were at liberty to withdraw. This offended Sprat, Aldrich, and Jane; the last rose in a pet to leave the room, but was persuaded to remain. Two days afterwards the Commissioners entered upon the consideration of ceremonies distasteful to Dissenters. Aldrich and Jane left soon after the debate commenced, and those who remained came to the conclusion that, as for receiving the Sacrament, "it should be in some posture of reverence, and in some convenient pew or place in the church, so that none but those that kneeled should come up to the rails or table, and that the persons scrupling, should some week-day before come

\* Spelt Aldridge in the "Parliamentary Return."

to the minister, and declare that they could not kneel with a good conscience.”\* This was agreed to, and at the next meeting they took up the question of god-fathers, Beveridge contending for the retention of them as being agreeable to ancient practice ; some, on the other hand, declaring that the custom often became a mere matter of interest, and even went so far as to assert, “that it was hard to find an instance of a child baptized before St. Cyprian’s time.”

The calendar underwent revision, and several Saints’ days were struck out of the list. Respecting the Athanasian Creed, much was said. Its use, its theological meaning, especially its damnatory clauses, had become in an age of rational inquiry, religious toleration, and latitudinarian sentiment, momentous moot-points. Burnet and Tillotson were willing to drop the so-called creed out of the service altogether, so was Fowler ;—the first of these Divines urging, that the Church of England received the four first General Councils, that the Ephesian Council opposed all new symbols, that the Athanasian Creed is *not very ancient*, and that it condemns the Greek Church, which, said the Bishop, “we defend.” The utmost amount of change finally recommended as to this formula was its less frequent use and an explanation of its damnatory clauses.

The subject of Ordination occupied the members through four successive meetings. The Bishop of Salisbury contended that there was room to challenge the orders of the Romanists ; that the Church of England had allowed those of Foreign Churches in the case of Du Moulin, Prebendary of Canterbury ; and that Presbyterians had been consecrated Bishops of the Scotch Church without being first ordained as Priests. As to

\* “Return,” 98.

Dissenters, he strove to apply to their case the allowed validity of Donatist ordination in the early Church. But it was on the Conservative side objected, that Romanist orders were owned by the Anglican Church ; and Beveridge, though maintaining Anglican views, admitted, in reference to the case of Du Moulin, that regular Episcopal ordination is not necessary, where no cure of souls is involved. In answer to the suggestion of the old compromise of hypothetical reference to the invalidity of any former ordination, Beveridge remarked that it looked like equivocation on the part of ordainer and ordained ; the first believing the second was not ordained before, contrary to the belief of the second, who did not doubt his former orders. Burnet replied, there could be no ground for such objection, if a statement were annexed to the effect that each reserved his own opinion. At last the Commissioners resolved upon adopting the hypothetical scheme, Beveridge and Scot alone dissenting from that conclusion.

In the Ordination Service the use of the words "receive the Holy Ghost" gave rise to much discussion, as a command to receive involves the possession on the speaker's part of a power to bestow ; and Burnet contended that such a use could not be traced back above 400 years, it having been introduced in the Middle Ages for the purpose of exalting the priesthood. The Bishop of St. Asaph and Dr. Scot, however, vindicated the Church of England in her employment of the Saviour's words, and asserted that if they be not retained, "there is no form of ordination authoritatively,"—a very unfortunate ground of defence, for, as it was justly said, if so, then, the words not being used in the absolute form until within the previous

four centuries, no valid ordinations had previously taken place. The rest of the time was spent in revising the Daily Prayer, the Communion and Confirmation Services, the Catechism, and other formularies, and in preparing new Collects.

It was left for further consideration whether the use of the surplice should be dispensed with, but numerous verbal alterations in the Liturgy were adopted for recommendation. To the Prayers and Thanksgivings upon several occasions were added two new forms : one a prayer to be said before receiving the Communion, another a prayer for any time of calamity. Forty-two new Collects were composed ; and in the administration of the Lord's Supper, after the Ten Commandments, came the insertion of the Beatitudes, with this petition after each of them, "Lord, have mercy upon us, and make us partakers of this blessing." Here, and throughout the whole Prayer-Book, for the title *priest* was substituted that of *minister*. In the office for baptism godfathers and godmothers were not to be essential, if parents undertook the duty of instruction and care, nor was the sign of the Cross to be used of necessity. Large additions were made to the Catechism and to the Confirmation Service, the prayers after the last answer being considerably modified ; and a new prayer and exhortation prepared for the confirmed, who were required to stay and listen to it. The "Solemnization of Matrimony," with several verbal changes, remains substantially unaltered ; but in "the Order for the Visitation of the Sick," together with fresh interrogatories, there is this important change in the words of absolution : "Our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath left power to His Church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in Him, of His great

mercy, forgive thee thine offences ; and upon thy true faith and repentance, by His authority committed to me, I pronounce thee absolved from all thy sins, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Verbal alterations in the Burial Service were proposed.

No one who takes the trouble to read through the report of these tedious proceedings but must be astonished at the extent of the suggested alterations. They prove that some of the Episcopalian Divines who took part in the revision of 1689 must have been a very different class of men from the Episcopalian Divines who took part in the revision of 1662. Calamy became acquainted with the alterations, and said he thought if the scheme had been carried out, it would "have brought in two-thirds of the Dissenters."\* No doubt a considerable number might have been satisfied, but I consider Calamy to have been too sanguine in his expectation ; his expectation resting mainly on what he knew of Presbyterians, who were much more disposed to return to the Establishment than were brethren of other denominations. But in addition to circumstances already mentioned unfavourable to Comprehension, the triumph of Presbyterianism in Scotland, which involved the abolition of Prelacy in that country, produced in Prelatists a great deal of bad feeling, and stood in the way of the present attempt ; this obstacle was greatly increased by Nonconformist attacks at the time upon the use of Liturgies, and by a constantly augmenting number of Nonconformist ordinations. Besides, although extensive alterations came under discussion, very few Episcopilians were disposed to go

\* Calamy's "Abridgment," 448. †The alterations cover 90 pages, and amount to 598 in number.

such lengths as were proposed ; some who were active in the affair were also cautious, and an immense majority outside the Committee utterly disliked the whole business, and were opposed to any alteration whatever in the formularies.\*

The changes did not touch any articles of faith. D'Huisseau, a distinguished professor and pastor at Saumur, proposed the reunion of Christendom on the broadest doctrinal basis, and received support from several Calvinistic Divines of considerable note. The English Episcopalians, who moved in the matter as just described, rather resembled Jurieu, an eminent French theologian, ordained by an Anglican Bishop, yet officiating as a Presbyterian clergyman in France and in Holland. He advocated Comprehension on an orthodox basis, and treated Church organization and forms of worship as of minor importance.

The sittings of the Commission ended on November the 18th. The labour was in vain. All that remains of it is a royal octavo pamphlet in blue paper covers, published some years ago by order of the House of Commons.

Much excitement had been manifested during the clerical elections in the year 1661, but there was far greater excitement during the election of 1689. Canvassing for members of Parliament was an old custom, but canvassing for members of Convocation was a new one, and at the time it was noticed as a sign of party spirit then so rife. The fact is remarkable, that whilst the official members of the Lower House included many distinguished men, nobody of any mark was elected, except Dr. John Mill, the eminent Greek scholar,

\* See "Letter to a Friend, containing some Queries," and also "Vox Cleri."

who edited a new version of the text of the New Testament. By far the majority was composed of persons who had long been Tories in politics, and now showed themselves to be High Churchmen in religion; but the Upper House—thinned through refusal to attend by those nonjuring Prelates who still survived, two of them having died—contained decidedly liberal politicians and divines in the persons of Compton, Lloyd, Burnet, and Patrick, the last of whom had in September been raised to the Bishopric of Chichester. These Bishops took the lead in the proceedings of that assembly, and imparted to them a liberal spirit. The difference between the temper of the two Houses soon appeared.

Convocation had formerly met first at St. Paul's, and afterwards at Westminster. Now that the new Cathedral of London, though nearly completed, had not been consecrated, Convocation assembled at once within the walls of Henry VII.'s Chapel, when a Latin sermon was preached by Beveridge. As soon as the Lower House proceed to business, the choice of a Prolocutor is the first step. On the 21st of November, Sharp, who had in the Deanery of Canterbury succeeded Tillotson, now made Dean of St. Paul's, proposed as Prolocutor his distinguished predecessor, who was a friend of the King, a favourite at Court, a man of prudence and moderation, and a promoter of the scheme of Comprehension. But Tillotson was rejected by two to one in favour of Jane. Nobody could mistake the significance of the choice. It would appear that personal feeling had some influence on it. The Earls of Clarendon and Rochester are accused of having intrigued against Tillotson from resentment towards his patrons, the King and Queen—the latter of them,

although their near relative, not having raised them to any high employments in the State. Moreover, it had become known, that Tillotson was intended by William to be Sancroft's successor, as soon as Sancroft's deposition could be legally accomplished. This circumstance stung the mind of Compton, who, on account of his former relation to the Queen as her tutor, and the signal service he had rendered at the Revolution, not to mention his noble rank, considered he had a claim superior to that of the Dean. Unworthy motives are often attributed to men upon insufficient grounds, and I am unable to discover the reasons for Tillotson's unfavourable opinion of Compton; but as Tillotson was not likely to have adopted suspicions without reason, it is probable that Compton had something to do with the rejection of Tillotson as a candidate for the Prolocutorship. Knowing what human nature is, one does not wonder that Compton was annoyed at Tillotson being preferred to him; yet it should be remembered that if Compton was mortified by the Royal preference for Tillotson, it did not at present induce him to abandon the liberal party. When Jane the Prolocutor was presented to Compton as President of the Upper Chamber, in the room of the absent Primate, he finished a speech upon the perfection of the Church, and the mischief of any change in it, with the words, "*Nolumus leges Angliae mutari*,"—in allusion, it is inferred, to Compton's having adopted that motto for the colours of his regiment, when he had played the part of a colonel. The Bishop, in his answer, indicated his adherence to the opinions and measures he had before proposed, by saying to the Clergy, that "they ought to endeavour a temper in those things that are not essential in religion, thereby to open the door of salva-

tion to a multitude of straying Christians ; that it must needs be their duty to show the same indulgence and charity to the Dissenters under King William, which some of the Bishops and Clergy had promised to them in their addresses to King James."\*

After the Royal Commission authorizing the Convocation to proceed to business had been read, the Bishops prepared an address. In this address they thanked His Majesty for the zeal he had shown "for the Protestant religion in general, and the Church of England in particular." † To these words a strong objection was taken by the Lower House. First, they claimed a right to present an address of their own, which being disallowed, they claimed a right to offer amendments. They wished the address to be confined to what concerned the Church of England, and no mention to be made of the Protestant religion in general. An amendment being carried to that effect, there followed a conference between the two Houses. The Lower House desired the words "Established Church" to be employed, which led to a dispute between Burnet and the Prolocutor. The Bishop argued, that the Church of England as established was only distinguished from other Churches by its hierarchy and revenues, and that if Popery were restored there would still be an Established Church of England. The Prolocutor replied, that the Church was distinguished by its Articles, Liturgy, and Homilies.

The discussion between these two Divines resembled that between the two knights who could not agree

\* Tillotson's "Life," 202. Jane, it should be recollectcd, was a friend of Compton. He was his chaplain, and preached at his consecration.

† Cardwell's "Conferences," 434, 451. "Synodalia," 692-700.

about the device on a shield, because the first looked at it on one side and the second on the other. The fact is, that the disputants were thinking of different things. Burnet was thinking only of the circumstance of an Establishment, of that which is a mere incident to any Church connected with the State ; so considering the question, no doubt he was right. Jane, on the other hand, was thinking of the Church itself, and not the establishment of it. Consequently he was wrong in saying what he did of the Church as established, though he would have been right had Burnet used the disputed words in the sense in which Jane was employing them. The logomachy terminated in a compromise ; and the two Houses concurred in thanking William for the zeal he had expressed concerning the honour, peace, advantage, and establishment of the English Church, whereby they doubted not the interest of the Protestant religion, which in all other Protestant Churches was dear to them, would be the better secured. The King, in reply, assured the Bishops, that they might depend on his former promises, and he gave a new assurance that he would improve all occasions and opportunities for serving the Church of England. There also occurred in this Convocation, debates about proxies, complaints respecting the custody of Convocation records, and charges brought against the publication of books on the Athanasian Creed, contrary to the Canons ; Burnet tells us that the majority in Convocation refused to consider any compromise with the Dissenters, one argument being that it was derogatory to the Church to make overtures to them until they expressed a desire for reconciliation, and either offered proposals

themselves, or showed a willingness to consider proposals made by others.\*

Convocation adjourned on the 16th of December through successive prorogations, and remained inoperative for ten years.

\* Kennet, "Hist.," III. 552.

## CHAPTER IV.

IN the early part of the year 1689, events occurred which increased the importance of exacting the prescribed oaths. James left France in the month of March. Rumour ran that he had reached England, that he was in London, that he was secretly lodged in the house of Lloyd, the Nonjuror.\* This proved to be a mistake. He landed at Kingsale in Ireland. But with the people of Ireland James found little favour, the Protestants disliking him as a Papist, the Papists suspecting him because they considered his policy towards Protestants too lenient. In support of his attempt to recover the crown, his army laid siege to Londonderry, and the French navy skirmished with an English squadron in Bantry Bay. This occurred in April. A Parliament, at his summons, met in Dublin the following month, and from the Castle, where he took up his residence, he issued a Declaration to his Irish subjects, exhorting them to support his claims.

Roussel, a French Protestant Minister, who after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes had witnessed the demolition of his church, and had dared one night, at the request of his congregation, to preach amidst the ruins, was for the offence sentenced to be broken on

\* "Tanner MSS.," 28, 377. Letter from Lloyd to Sancroft, March 31, 1689.

the wheel. Having effected his escape from France, he happened, at the time of James' arrival in Ireland, to be an exile there. One of the first things done by this Royal friend of religious liberty was to deliver the refugee to the Ambassador of Louis, who had him conveyed home to undergo his sentence. Copies of James' Declaration were circulated in England, and found their way to Cambridge. One Thomas Fowler, from the University, stood at the bar of the House of Commons on the 20th of June, to state that the documents came down in boxes, directed to the Masters of Queen's and St. John's ; and one of the Burgesses for the University acquainted the House, that the boxes were in the custody of the Vice-Chancellor.

The Government in England, with its elected Sovereign, was challenged to submit to the cashiered King, or to hold its own by force of arms. The gauntlet being thrown down before the world, no alternative remained but for William to return to Holland, or to fight out the contest as best he could. The position in which these circumstances placed him in reference to the Nonjurors is obvious. Personally he had no disposition to come to extremities with them ; he had given proof of a desire to treat them with the utmost leniency ; but the exigencies of his position rendered it indispensable that at this moment he should be unyielding towards all justly suspected of disaffection. Of the disaffection of the Nonjurors there could be no doubt. James was their anointed King ; William was esteemed by them as a usurper.

Three nonjuring Prelates died in the course of the spring and summer. Cartwright, the semi-Popish Bishop of Chester, after joining James at St. Germains, accompanied him to Ireland, where on the 15th of

April he expired, having received on his death-bed the sacrament and the absolution of the Church of England, instead of conforming to Rome, as at the time he was reported to have done.\* Thomas, Bishop of Worcester, died June the 25th, solemnly declaring on his death-bed that, if his heart did not deceive him, and the grace of God failed him not, he thought he could burn at a stake before he would take the new oath.† Lake, Bishop of Chichester, followed Thomas to the grave in the month of August, expressing satisfaction with the course which he had pursued, and declaring his conviction that the oaths were inconsistent with the doctrine of passive obedience, which he maintained to be a doctrine of the English Church.

The Prelates who had not sworn, persistently continued to refuse the oaths; the Primate being reproached with his inconsistency for the part he had taken in the Revolution. He was insolently told by a Jacobite correspondent in Holland, "Your Grace has forfeited your neck already in signing that traitorous Declaration at Guildhall, wherein you cast off your allegiance to your lawful Sovereign, and applied yourself to the Prince of Orange."‡ Free to discharge their functions up to the 1st of August, 1689, the Bishops were then suspended from the exercise of them. Still they enjoyed their benefices, and continued to reside in their palaces. The interim was occupied by the defence of their opinions. Sancroft, following the bent of his disposition, shut himself up at Lambeth, retaining impracticable views of a Regency, refusing to acknowledge

\* Salmon's "Lives," 388.

† "Life of Kettlewell," 199.

‡ "Tanner MSS.," 27, 16. Letter from the Hague, April 23, 1689.

William and Mary, combining good intentions with narrowness of mind, and saying to the last, with Pius the IX. at Rome, *Non possumus*. Lloyd, Bishop of Norwich, unfortunately sympathized with the Archbishop, and encouraged him in his policy. Ken, a far different man, firm in principle, of a tender conscience, yet open to conviction, careless about his interests, only anxious to do what was right, almost resolved to submit. But, after a night's rest, he said to Dr. Hooper, who had pressed submission upon him, "I question not but that you, and several others, have taken the oaths with as good a conscience as myself shall refuse them; and sometimes you have almost persuaded me to comply by the arguments you have used; but I beg you to use them no further, for should I be persuaded to comply, and after see reason to repent, you would make me the most miserable man in the world." \*

Turner, Bishop of Ely, another of the nonjuring band, whose character has been indicated already, whose Jacobitism is unquestionable, supported the Archbishop; but Frampton, Bishop of Gloucester, coincided with Ken in his moderation; and if the rest had resembled them, possibly a practical adjustment of the controversy might have been reached.

During the period of the Bishops' remaining in suspension, their case excited immense interest. The press was employed. Apologies were published; answers were returned. On the one hand the services of the Seven in the cause of liberty were gratefully rehearsed, their sufferings pitifully depicted, their temper under trials enthusiastically extolled, and the sacredness of oaths, as asserted in their conduct

\* "Life of Ken," by a Layman, 365.

earnestly enforced. Connected with this vindication and eulogy, were mystical allusions to the perfect number of the Episcopal confessors, the Seven imprisoned being irreverently compared to the burning lamps before the throne of God. On the other hand, this play of fancy met with sarcasm and ridicule, the old arguments for the new oaths came into hackneyed use, the patient temper of the Bishops failed to excite any longer much admiration, and a ridiculous panegyric pronounced upon them for “the holy tears” they wept, like “trees of sovereign balm, to cure the wounds of their Royal enemy,” only aroused mockery, whilst their suffering and services were depreciated by a reference to the story of Alexander the Great. Alexander had coats of armour made for men and horses three times the ordinary size, and left behind on the banks of the River Indus, to make succeeding ages believe that his soldiery were of gigantic bigness. So, it was said, the setting forth a few days’ imprisonment in the Royal palace of the Tower, under the notion of its being a prison such as confined the primitive Christians, detracted from the real glory gained by the Bishops, since everybody saw the vast disproportion between the dungeons of Diocletian and the Tower of London.\*

As the 1st of February approached, a few Clergymen in the archdeaconry of Sudbury applied to their Diocesan, Lloyd, Bishop of Norwich, telling him that though they thought of nothing less than losing all, yet they passionately desired to know whether they should voluntarily leave their respective cures, or wait to be forcibly thrust out; also they wished to know

\* “An Examination of the Case of the Suspended Bishops.” 1690, p. 12.

how they were to behave, so as, if possible, to preserve the ancient Church of England. He informed them that in the opinion of eminent lawyers a judicial sentence alone could eject them ; and therefore that they might retain possession until they were judicially expelled. Their second question he left unanswered.\* Whether Lloyd's notion of law was right or wrong, the Clergy generally did not act upon it, for most of them quietly quitted possession on the 1st of February.† Amongst the most distinguished of these Nonjurors were George Hickes, Dean of Worcester ; Henry Dodwell, who, though not in orders, was Camden Professor of Ancient History at Oxford ; Jeremy Collier, Lecturer at Gray's Inn ; and John Kettlewell, Vicar of Coleshill, in Warwickshire.

Hickes was a man of great learning, skilled both in patristic lore and Teutonic tongues. He was brother to the Nonconformist Minister of the name, who suffered death after Monmouth's rebellion ; but, so far from being tainted with his brother's sentiments, he was an intense opponent of Nonconformity, and an extravagant assertor of passive obedience. He published the last speeches of two Presbyterian Ministers, under the title of "The Spirit of Popery, speaking out of the Mouths of Fanatical Protestants ;" and declared, in his "Thebæan Legion," that if King James should imitate the Emperor Maximian, and doom his soldiers to death, for refusing to commit idolatry, it would be their duty to submit with meekness to the Royal decree. He wrote letters to a Popish priest, and an apologetical vindication of the English Church, in answer to those who reproached her with heresy and

\* "Life of Kettlewell." Appendix, Nos. II., III.

† Lathbury's "Nonjurors," 85.

schism; and he also composed a book, entitled “*Speculum Beatæ Virginis, a Discourse of the due Praise and Heroism of the Virgin Mary.*” These works indicate what manner of man he must have been, yet it is affirmed that at first he felt disposed to take the oaths, and came up to London for the purpose, but swerved from it through the influence of his High Church friends ; a statement which seems very improbable.\* Dodwell was still more learned than Hickes, and if in his theories more absurd, he was in practice more reasonable.

Inferior to Collier in point of ability, and to Dodwell and Hickes in point of learning, Kettlewell exceeded them in the fervour of his piety and in the force of his character. Eminently spiritual and devout, with his heart fixed upon another world, he threw into his life and ministry a spiritual force, which touched as with an electric spark those who came in contact with him, and made him a centre of power, though he was free from any ambition to become a party leader. He had been Chaplain in the Bedford family, and had been held in affectionate esteem by Lord William Russell, though he utterly differed from him in political opinion, for Kettlewell strongly maintained the doctrine of passive obedience. He did not join in the outcry against Popery in the reign of James II.; he thought it betrayed unworthy fears to be so alarmed at the antagonism of error ; and instead of preaching against Romanism, he enforced the doctrines of the Creeds. When others were exclaiming against the miscarriages of Government, he, it is said, turned the thoughts of his hearers upon themselves, bidding them contemplate the judgment of God, adore His wisdom, and submit

\* It occurs in the “*Life of Kennet,*” 47.

to His will.\* The use which he meant to be made of these religious reflections was to reconcile people to the ruling powers, and to repress the idea of resisting them, whatever might be the excesses to which they ran. The temper of the man, the tone of his churchmanship, and the preparation he was making for his ultimate position as a Nonjuror, are very plain ; and with peculiarities of this kind he blended a love of Ritualism, which expressed itself in rather an unusual form, for when a new set of Communion plate had been presented to the church at Coleshill, he caused the vessels to be dedicated by Archbishop Sancroft. Kettlewell is described as of a peaceable disposition ; but it is clear from his Memoirs that the ardour of his affections led him to speak and act with a vehemence not agreeable to those who differed from him, and "the true effigies" of his face prefixed to the book, confirm the inference which in this respect must be drawn from the narrative. He was unquestionably a man of enthusiasm, and his enthusiasm had a capacity for becoming fanatical.

The Nonjurors were not so numerous as Kettlewell and others wished. Only six joined him in his own county. In the diocese of Lichfield and Coventry there might be twenty. In one archdeaconry in the diocese of Norwich there might be half that number, owing to the influence of a nonjuring Bishop. In one College at Cambridge there was a considerable majority of Nonjurors, attributable to the party spirit they managed to maintain. Altogether, about 400 Clergymen quitted the Establishment. When we remember how prevalent had been the doctrines of the Divine right of Kings, and of the absolute submission

\* "Life of Kettlewell," 152.

of subjects ; when, besides this, we recollect the nature of the education given at Oxford, where the decree against the opposite doctrines had been daily read, and constantly hung up in the Colleges, I wonder that the Nonjurors were not more numerous.

Dignitaries were not so submissive as their inferior brethren. In defiance of the Act of Parliament, non-juring Bishops retained their palaces ; and so lenient was the Government, that, at the eleventh hour, forms of proviso were proposed, under which Nonjurors might continue to enjoy their benefices. But such overtures of kindness were regarded with suspicion.\*

The King assembled a new Parliament on the 2nd of April. Terrific excitement prevailed at the elections. The Whigs denounced the Tories as Jacobites, and the Jacobites as Papists. The Tories denounced the Whigs as Republicans, Fanatics, Latitudinarians, and Atheists. The Tories had the best of it, and returned a majority. Yet in spite of defeats, the Whigs took heart and concocted plans, hoping to frustrate the opposite policy. Before the Revolution, the conduct of the Ministry affected most materially the affairs of the Church and the condition of Dissenters ; after the passing of the Allegiance Act, the Church was little affected by the policy of the Government, except as connected with Convocation ; still less did that policy touch the Dissenters after the passing of the Toleration Act.

In anticipation of the Irish campaign, a national fast was fixed for the 12th of March, when prayers were offered for the personal safety of William. Immediately afterwards, a form of prayer of a very

\* This appears from a letter by Lloyd (Feb. 19, 1689) in the "Tanner MSS."

different description was printed and circulated. It referred to England as in a state of religious apostacy, and it sought the restoration of James without mentioning him by name. He was referred to as the stone which the builders rejected, and which God would make the head of the corner. This inflammatory performance under a devout disguise aroused indignation, and numbers of the adherents of William ascribed its composition to the Nonjurors. The excitement against the Bishops of that party was increased by a publication, in which they were styled "the Reverend Club of Lambeth," "the Holy Jacobite Club," "wretches, great contrivers, and managers of Cabals," who loved "to trample on the Dissenters, now happily out of their clutches." The new prayers are called the Bishops' "Great Guns;" and Ken is alluded to as a fellow who had eaten King William's bread. The most shameful passage is one in which, under a covert allusion to the massacre of the De Witts in Amsterdam, a violent assault upon the individuals abused is obviously suggested.\*

The Bishops published a vindication of themselves, denying that they had any share in the recent form of prayer, or that they had any knowledge as to who were the writers. They had all, they went on to declare, actually or virtually, hazarded whatever they possessed in opposing Popery and arbitrary power; and were still ready to sacrifice their very lives in the same noble cause. In conclusion, they lamented the misfortune that they were unable to publish full and particular replies to the many libels which were industriously circulated by enemies, to the injury of their reputation. The authorship of the prayers being

\* "A Modest Enquiry," printed in "State Tracts," Vol. II.

denied by the Bishops, it was attributed to Hickes, or to Sherlock, or to Kettlewell ; on their behalf a protest was entered against such a suspicion in the Life of the last of these persons ; but some sympathy with the New Liturgy is betrayed by the writer, when, without any condemnatory or qualifying remark, he calls it “as solemn and expressive as any could well be.”\*

On the 1st of July, 1690, the memorable Battle of the Boyne was fought and won by William III. He received a slight wound ; and that slight wound created an unexampled sensation throughout England and the cities and courts of Europe. A letter conveying the intelligence reached the Queen at Whitehall just as she was going to chapel ; and, to use her own expression, it frightened her out of her wits. But out of her senses with trouble one day, she was out of her senses with joy the next, to find the injury turned out to be very slight.† Paris, at first frantic with exultation on hearing of the supposed death of the great enemy of France, sunk into rageful disappointment to find that he was still alive, and ready to fight further battles in support of Protestantism. Strange as it may appear, but the strange combinations of European parties and politics at that time will account for it, the tidings of the wound brought no joy to Rome, any more than to Austria. Both were reassured by a true report of the fate of William. “No mortal man,” said Tillotson, “ever had his shoulder so kindly kissed by a cannon bullet ;” a felicitous turn of expression, which even South, with all his prejudice against Tillotson, could not fail to admire.‡

\* See “Life of Ken,” by a Layman, 370–376. Compare “Life of Kettlewell,” 255–263. † Dalrymple, III., Appen. II. 130, 132.

‡ Birch’s “Life of Tillotson,” 306.

The Battle of the Boyne led to an important clerical conversion. William Sherlock, Master of the Temple, had distinguished himself in the reign of James II., not only by his zeal in contending against Popery, but also by his decision in maintaining the principle of non-resistance. He strongly disapproved of the turn which affairs took at the Revolution, and advocated negotiations with the exiled Monarch, in reference to his being restored upon terms which would preserve constitutional liberty. The accession of the Prince and Princess of Orange inspired indignation, and the new oaths were by him unhesitatingly declined. He threw in his lot with the Nonjurors, who regarded his talents with respect and his character with admiration ; and they esteemed the support of a man so popular as a tower of strength. After losing the Mastership of the Temple, he retired into private life, and, pensive amidst misfortunes, wrote and published his celebrated treatise on Death. Still he deprecated schism ; disapproved of the establishment of any Episcopal sect ; advised those who could conscientiously remain, not to forsake their parish churches ; and even officiated himself at St. Dunstan's, actually reading the prayers for William and Mary. When the Battle of the Boyne decided the fate of the exile, and secured peace for the occupants of the throne, Sherlock looked at things in another light, became reconciled to the revolutionary settlement, and took the oaths which he had before refused. As a consequence, he returned to the Mastership of the Temple, and also received the Deanery of St. Paul's, vacated by Tillotson's elevation to Canterbury. So prominent a man on the nonjuring side, could not pass through such a conversion without giving some reasons for it ; accordingly he wrote a

book, which he entitled, “The Case of the Allegiance due to Sovereign Powers stated and resolved according to Scripture and Reason and the Principles of the Church of England.” Sancroft, soon after the Revolution, published what was called Bishop Overall’s “Convocation Book.” The Convocations of Canterbury and York had endorsed the contents of Overall’s volume; and, by a canon, distinctly condemned the doctrine that a Government begun by rebellion, after being thoroughly settled, is not of God.\* Sherlock made a good deal out of this, and said he should have continued to stick at the oaths, had he not been relieved by Overall’s book, and had not the authority of Convocation given him a freedom of thinking, which apprehensions of singularity had cramped before.† He did not believe, as is sometimes represented, that the Bishop and Convocation settled the matter, and that he was to submit as a child to the authoritative decree, but that a door had been thereby opened to the sons of the Church to reconsider the subject.‡ Having been thus induced to examine the question afresh, he—for various reasons, which he assigned, some of which, it must be acknowledged, run counter to his previous publications on the subject §—had reached the conclusion that he could conscientiously take the vow required.

\* “Convocation Book,” Bk. I.c. 28. Edition in “Library of Anglo-Cathc. Theology,” 50, 51.

† “Case of Allegiance,” Preface.

‡ Macaulay (VI. 47) overstates the effect on Sherlock of the “Convocation Book” when he says, “His venerable Mother the Church had spoken, and he, with the docility of a child, accepted her decree.”

§ These inconsistencies are set forth in a pamphlet entitled “Sherlock against Sherlock.” Amongst the “Baker MSS.,” 40, 75, Cambridge University Library, is an undated letter written by Sherlock, respecting Overall’s “Convocation Book.”

A terrible storm assailed him after this. Argument, satire, and abuse, sometimes in vulgar prose, sometimes in doggerel rhyme, descended in torrents upon his devoted head. Nonjurors reviled him on the one side, Revolutionists on the other ; and people who did not care for either side joined in the old English cry against turncoats and time-servers. Most people maintained he had changed for the sake of loaves and fishes ; and, as Mrs. Sherlock had made herself very notorious, and was said to have had immense influence over her husband, she caught a terrible pelting from a literary mob, who assailed her as Xantippe, Delilah, and Eve, all in one. Sherlock had to pay the penalty, which men, whose new opinions jump in the same direction as their pecuniary interest, must ever pay ; but human motives, whether good or evil, lie so far beneath the surface, that the reading of them by even honest historians may widely differ from the reading of them by the only Omniscient One. Contemporaries were too much involved in party strife to take an unbiased view of Sherlock's conduct, and writers since have scarcely been able to free themselves from prejudices handed down by the pamphlets of that day. The grave feature of the case affecting the reputation of the Master and Dean, is to be found, not in the new application of a principle which he had long held, but in the repudiation of his old principles, just at the moment when the Battle of the Boyne had destroyed all prospect of James' restoration,—a chance upon which, as Sherlock's enemies believed, he had ventured hopes of high preferment, during the time of casting in his lot with the poor Nonjurors.

The Battle of the Boyne having established the Revolution, and with it the throne of William, the

people who had hailed him as their Deliverer became more than ever impatient towards all who remained disaffected towards his Government.

Nonjurors lived on both sides the Irish Channel. Soon after the battle which decided the fate of James, though it did not crush the hopes and schemes of his supporters, William had his attention called to the refusal of the Bishop of Ossory to pray for him in public worship. "His Majesty's command," said the Secretary of State to the delinquent, "is, that your Lordship be suspended till further order. I know not the terms, being here in a camp, that are used in things of this nature; but I acquaint your Lordship of His Majesty's present resentment, and can say no more till I hear from your Lordship herein."\* Nonjurors on this side of the Channel, however, gave much more trouble than they did on the other. A scheme for the restoration of James came to light at the end of 1690. The leader of the conspiracy was Richard Graham, Viscount Preston, Secretary of State in the preceding reign, whose patent of nobility had been drawn up at St. Germain, and who retained his seals of office in spite of the Revolution. Secret conferences were held amongst the English Jacobites, and as the result, Lord Preston, with a person named Ashton and another companion, were despatched with treasonable papers to the ex-King; but ere they had passed Tilbury Fort, in a smack which was to convey them to the shores of France, they were seized and brought back to London. Preston and Ashton were tried, convicted, and condemned at the Old Bailey. Ashton was executed, Preston was pardoned, and as they lay under sentence of death, the sympathies of the

\* Mant's "Hist. of the Church of Ireland," II., Preface.

Nonjurors eagerly gathered round them, and Collier and Cooke, two well-known members of the party, wrote to Sancroft, who still lingered in his Archiepiscopal Palace on the banks of the Thames, earnestly seeking to enlist his offices on behalf of the culprits.\* Turner, Bishop of Ely, was charged with complicity in Preston's treasonable business, and two suspicious letters were produced, said to be in the Prelate's handwriting; but I cannot find evidence of their authorship, or proof in their contents justifying a charge of treason. As Turner immediately hid himself, and then absconded, it looks, notwithstanding, as if he felt conscious guilt; but concealment in his case seems to have been a difficult matter, for he had such a remarkable nose, that Sancroft, with a play of humour, which occasionally illuminated his misfortunes, spoke of his friend as resembling Paul's ship of Alexandria, which carried a well-known sign upon its prow, or beak. Hence, though London was a great wood, it would be hard for one with such a face, however disguised by a patriarchal beard, or by a huge peruke, to escape detection.† It is not a little remarkable that, though the deposed Primate prayed for his friend's safety, he expressed no conviction of his friend's innocence.

The Nonjurors had been treated with consideration and kindness. Though forfeiting their Sees in February, 1690, after which successors were nominated, the Prelates of the party were allowed to retain their palaces; and even as late as April, 1691, attempts were made by friends of the Government to compromise matters with them, in spite of the increased odium cast on their order by Turner's conduct: it

\* "Tanner MSS." Jan. 20, 1691. † Ken's "Life," 381.

was proposed that, at least, they should disavow all share in the alleged conspiracy, but Sancroft would do nothing of the kind, easy and reasonable as such a concession seemed. There remained now no alternative but to eject the disaffected. As the crisis approached, questions were raised and discussed touching the treatment of successors. Lloyd, Sancroft's busy correspondent, wrote to say how perplexed he felt, for, extreme as might be his views, they were surpassed by the views of others. He reported that they asked, what they should do in case they appeared at any of the new Episcopal elections,—should they oppose them? From such a proposal he shrunk, for to carry it out might incur a *præmunire*. Further, he inquired whether for him to recommend their absenting themselves would not be cowardly? Nonplussed by these problems, he despondingly added, “What, then, is to be done? Here I stick.” His friend Wagstaffe informed him, some had resolved to resist all Erastian intrusion, and expected the displaced Bishops would assert their rights. Lloyd grew testy at such an excess of zeal, and wished to know what the self-appointed critics would advise the Prelates to do? Had not those very critics submitted to deprivation? Of what use would it be for their superiors to do otherwise? \*

Hickes drew up a protest against his own ejection, idly declaring the appointment of a successor to be illegal, and as idly calling upon others to defend the rights of the dispossessed. This protesting ended in smoke. Hickes and Wagstaffe, as well as Lloyd,

\* 9th of May, 1691. “Tanner MSS.,” XXVI. 84. There are several more wearisome letters by Lloyd on this subject in the same collection.

had to succumb ; so had Frampton of Gloucester, and White of Peterborough. Sancroft yielded only to a legal process ; and at last, on Midsummer eve, between seven and eight o'clock, accompanied by the steward of his household and three other friends, he entered a boat at Lambeth ferry, which conveyed the little party to the Temple stairs, where the deprived Primate sought shelter for a few days in Palsgrave Court. One imagines, as amidst the lengthening shadows on the waters that same night he left for ever the towers of the familiar palace, he would cast "one longing, lingering look behind." But history preserves a more touching picture of the departure of Ken from the city of Wells. After he had from his pastoral chair asserted his Canonical right to remain Bishop of the Diocese, he passed through the gardens and crossed the drawbridge over the moat, whilst old and young crowded round him to ask his blessing and say farewell. "Mild, complacent, yet dignified," remarks the Layman who writes his life, "on retiring with a peaceful conscience from opulence and station to dependence and poverty, as the morning sun shone on the turreted chapel, we naturally imagine he may have shed only one tear, when looking back on those interesting scenes. Perhaps his eye might have rested on the pale faces of some of the poor old men and women who had partaken their Sunday dinner so often, and heard his discourse in the old hall."

Beveridge was offered the See of Bath and Wells ; but he was threatened by the Nonjurors, in case he should accept the offer, with the fate of schismatical usurpers, like Gregory and George of Cappadocia, who invaded the See of Alexandria, upon the deposi-

tion of the orthodox Athanasius. Beveridge declined ; whether or not influenced by rebukes and warnings I cannot say, but he remained a simple presbyter until after the death of King William.

Whilst Nonjurors were mourning over what had taken place, Nonconformists regarded the Revolution with thankfulness. William was, in their eyes, a Heaven-sent deliverer, and at weekly and monthly fasts they joined in prayer, that God's blessing might rest on his forces,\* which they regarded as being at war with Babylon. It is said that had the London Dissenters been requested to raise a monument to his memory, they would have provided a statue of gold :† and Calamy paints in bright colours their payment of taxes, and hearty intercession for both King and Queen. Mutual charity would have been exemplified if Howe's advice had prevailed, for he urged Con-formists and Nonconformists not to magnify diversities of opinion, but to promote the interests of a common Christianity. But on many people his sentiments fell as idle words ; and if by others they were heard for one moment, the very next they were drowned by the din of old controversies, or the outburst of new passions.

Death removed some distinguished Nonconformist Ministers at the era of the Revolution. John Bunyan, who belongs more to the universal Church than to a particular sect, died, as he had lived, in the Baptist communion. He has come before us in a former volume, not as a leader in ecclesiastical affairs, but as a sufferer for conscience' sake, and as an author of works which have won for him an unparalleled renown.

\* Thoresby's "Diary," I. 197. Calamy's "Life," I. 300.

† Crossby's "Hist. of the Baptists," III. 230.

He trod the paths of private life, save that when he came to London his “preaching attracted enormous multitudes ;” and it was in the city which had witnessed his vast popularity that he breathed his last. A minister of peace, he took a long journey on horseback to extinguish domestic strife, and on his way afterwards to the Metropolis, he brought on a fatal fever, through fatigue and exposure to heavy rains. This occurred in the month of August, 1688, when the throne of James was tottering to its fall, and plans which led to the Revolution were being formed ; probably whisperings of what was to happen to his country reached Bunyan’s ears in his last hours. Illness overtook him in the house of a friend named Strudwick, a grocer residing on Snow Hill.\* Just before his death Bunyan said to those around him, “Weep not for me, but for yourselves. I go to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who will, no doubt, through the mediation of His blessed Son, receive me, though a sinner, where I hope we ere long shall meet to sing the new song and remain everlastinglly happy, world without end.” “He felt the ground solid under his feet in passing the black river which has no bridge, and followed his pilgrim into the celestial city.” He expired before the end of August, and was interred in Bunhill Fields ; his church at Bedford lamented with unaffected sorrow his loss at the age of sixty ; and kept, the next month, days of humiliation and prayer for the heavy bereavement they had sustained.†

Dr. John Collinges, a Presbyterian, once Vicar of

\* Strudwick was a Deacon of the Congregational Church formed by George Cockayne, one of the ejected Clergy. He was buried in the same grave with Bunyan. (“Story of Hare Court,” 195, by J. B. Marsh.)

† “Memoir” by Offer. Bunyan’s “Works,” III. lxxiii.

St. Stephen's, Norwich, died in 1690. He had assisted Pool in his "Annotations," and written practical as well as controversial works. One of them entitled "The Weaver's Pocket-book, or Weaving Spiritualized," was no doubt suggested to him as he had stood watching the loom in the house of some industrious parishioner in days when the city of Norwich enjoyed the zenith of its manufacturing industry. He left behind a good reputation, being, as his brethren testified, "a man of various learning and excelling as a textuary and a critic, and generally esteemed for his great industry, humanity, and exemplary piety."

John Flavel ended his days on the 26th of June, 1691, at Exeter. He had, before his death, left the town of Dartmouth, the scene of his long and zealous ministrations, because the rabble, headed by certain aldermen, in 1685 paraded the town, carrying the good man's effigy to be burnt,—an insult he revenged by praying, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." With his lively imagination he combined intense spiritual emotion, and the story, which he relates in his "Pneumatologia" is so very curious that, though familiar from frequent quotation, it deserves to be inserted here. It exemplifies a phase of spiritual life belonging to an age which has passed away.\* "Being on a journey, he set himself to improve his time by meditation; when his mind grew intent, till at length he had such ravishing tastes of heavenly joys, and such full assurance of his interest therein, that he utterly lost the sight and sense of this world and all its concerns,

\* Mr. Maurice observes that "this story, which is told of Flavel the Nonconformist, is told also, and upon perfectly good evidence, of Francis Xavier the Jesuit." ("Kingdom of Christ," II. 344.) Flavel prefaches the story by saying, "I have with good assurance this account of a minister."

so that for hours he knew not where he was. At last, perceiving himself faint from a great loss of blood from his nose, he alighted from his horse and sat down at a spring, where he washed and refreshed himself; earnestly desiring, if it were the will of God, that he might there leave the world. His spirits reviving, he finished his journey in the same delightful frame. And all that night passed without a wink of sleep, the joy of the Lord still overflowing him, so that he seemed an inhabitant of the other world. After this, an heavenly serenity and sweet peace continued long with him ; and for many years he called that day one of the days of heaven, and professed he understood more of the life of heaven by it, than by all the discourses he had heard or the books he ever read."\*

Richard Baxter was an old man at the time of the Revolution, weighed down by suffering; and the Toleration Act came too late to give scope to energies which, had the event happened twenty years earlier, would have been ardently spent in tilling the newly opened fields of labour. Yet, when the adoption of the Doctrinal Articles of the Church was required as the condition of exercising a Nonconformist ministry, the trembling hand of the veteran theologian could not resist an impulse to write down scholastically the sense in which the Articles were to be subscribed. It was his own sense, yet it was also, as he believed, one in which many of his brethren concurred. Few, it is said, took notice of his explication, and at this we are not surprised, as his explication contains more in the way of suggestive thought than of explicit definition. His metaphysics, warmed by zeal for practical religion, appear distinctly in this farewell effort. He has some-

\* Palmer's "Nonconformist Memorial," I. 354.

thing abstruse to say as to the glorified body of Christ, and upon some other points ; and he lays down a dictum, often repeated since in a wider sense than he specifies, with regard to legislation in Church and State : “God’s laws are the supreme civil laws, man’s laws are but by-laws.” He also insists upon the doctrine of the Apostle James, as well as the doctrine of the Apostle Paul ; and, after charitably saying, “ all were not accursed that hoped well of Socrates, Antoinne, Alexander, Severus, Cicero, Epictetus, Plutarch,” and others, he adds, “there is no name, that is, no Messiah, to be saved by, but Christ.”\* In a tenement near his friend Sylvester’s, in Charter-house Square, Baxter spent his last days ; and when disabled from preaching in his friend’s meeting-house, he preached in his own dwelling, almost dying in the exercise of his favourite employment. “It would doubtless,” it is said, “have been his joy to have been transfigured on the Mount.” “He talked in the pulpit,” as one reports, “with great freedom about another world, like one who had been there, and was come as a sort of express from thence to make report concerning it.” His busy pen was employed as long as he could grasp it with his fingers, in writing something for the benefit of his fellow-men. At last growing infirmities confined him to his chamber, and then to his bed. There his vigorous mind “abode rational, strong in faith and hope, arguing itself into, and preserving itself in, that patience, hope, and joy, through grace.” With unaffected humility he spoke of himself as a sinner worthy of being condemned for the best duty he ever did, whose hopes were all “from the free mercy of God in Christ.” Reminded of the good which his works had

\* Calamy’s “Abridgment,” 469-475.

produced, he replied, "I was but a pen in God's hands, and what praise is due to a pen?" When extremity of pain constrained him to pray for release, he would check himself with the words, "It is not fit for me to prescribe;—*when Thou wilt, what Thou wilt, and how Thou wilt!*" "Oh! how unsearchable are His ways, and His paths past finding out; the reaches of His providence we cannot fathom! Do not think the worse of religion for what you see me suffer." He had assurance of future happiness, and great peace and joy in believing, only lamenting that because of pain he could not express all he felt. Still he spoke of heaven, and quoting the Apostle's description of the celestial Church, remarked, that it deserved a thousand thousand thoughts. With characteristic width of sympathy, he spent many of his last hours in praying for a distracted world, and a divided Church. Physical pain, his old companion, continued to the last. "I have pain," he said, "there is no arguing against sense; but I have peace—I have peace." The catalogue of his diseases is enough to excite pity in the most inhuman, and our sensibilities are positively tortured by the pathetic descriptions he gives of himself. They illustrate the beautifulness of his oft-quoted answer to the question, How he did?—"Almost well." "On Monday, about five in the evening," says Sylvester, "Death sent his harbinger to summon him away. A great trembling and coldness awakened nature, and extorted strong cries, which continued for some time;" at length he ceased, waiting in patient expectation for his change. The gentle cry in the ear of his housekeeper, "Death, death!" betokened full consciousness at the last moment, and turning to thank a friend for his visit, he exclaimed, "The Lord teach you to die." About four

o'clock on the morning of the 8th of December, 1691, he had done for ever with the sorrows of mortality, and entered on the saints' everlasting rest. His body sleeps in Christchurch beside the ashes of his wife and mother. Many vied in doing honour to his memory. Conformists as well as Nonconformists carried him to the grave, and made great lamentations over him; a train of mourning-coaches reached from Merchant Taylors' Hall—whence the corpse was carried—to the place of burial.

At the commencement of the year 1692, another of the old Puritans left this world. He represented a class which had borne the brunt of the battle, and who, when the Revolution brought peace, loved to relate stories of sufferings which promoted Dissent, after the severer laws against it were relaxed. Francis Holcroft, son of a knight residing at Westham, near London, was sent to Clare Hall, Cambridge, where Dr. Cudworth was Master, and David Clarkson a Fellow. Under the instructions of the latter, the gownsman became a Puritan, and as, on a Sunday morning, he sat over the College Gate, in a chamber which he shared in common with young Tillotson, described as "his bed-fellow," he sometimes observed a horse, which was brought up for one of the Fellows, who served the living of Littlington, and which was frequently led away without its master. Pitying the sheep without a shepherd, the young Puritan offered to supply the neglected parish, where his services were crowned with signal success. Promoted in 1655 to the Vicarage of Bassingbourne, he became exceedingly popular, and, not content with the effect of his sermons, he felt anxious to establish ecclesiastical discipline, and therefore formed a Church upon Congregational principles.

At the Restoration things changed. Holcroft was ejected, and the sheep were scattered. He met them as he could, some in one place, some in another ; but the circuit of his labours becoming too wide for his failing strength, he arranged that four members should assist him in pastoral work. Worship was disturbed by the beating of drums, and the pastor was imprisoned ; but the greater the persecution the more his popularity increased, and when silenced as a preacher, he sent pastorals round his wide rural diocese. For some time the congregations to which he ministered, formed of Baptists and Pædobaptists, constituted only one Church ; but after the Revolution they settled down into distinct communities. The memory of Holcroft still lingers in the neighbourhood of Cambridge, and old barns in which he ministered were pointed out a few years ago. He died on the 6th of January, 1692. Before his departure, spiritual tranquillity, awhile disturbed, was happily restored, for he died exclaiming, “I know that if the earthly house of this tabernacle be dissolved, I have a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.” He sleeps in a small burial-ground beside the churchyard of Oakington, four miles from Cambridge. Three flat stones cover the spot hallowed by the remains of two other Nonconformist ministers, as well as his own. Over his resting-place are inscribed the appropriate words, “They that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament ; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever.”

Several others of the ejected died about the period of the Revolution. Veneration for them increased as death swept them away : their virtues were embalmed ; their names were canonized. Collectors

of anecdotes published whatever they could find respecting the departed, sometimes accompanied by severe reflections upon the old laws which had thrust them out of the gates of the Establishment. People in Derbyshire were told that rich as might be their treasures in wool and lead, the shepherds they had lost were more precious than all the flocks grazing on their beautiful hills ; and the sermons they had preached were costlier than all the metals dug out of their capacious mines. After a short beadroll of pastors in the county, the writer asks, What hath cast away the shields of the mighty ? *Uniformity*. What hath slain the beauty of England, and made the mighty fall ? *Uniformity*. What hath despoiled the neck of the Church, like the tower of David builded for an armoury, whereon there hung a thousand bucklers, all shields of mighty men ? *Uniformity*.\*

\* “Life of Mr. John Hieron, etc.,” by D. Burgess, 1691.

## CHAPTER V.

IT is a curious coincidence that Tillotson, Barrow, and Howe were all born in the year 1630. Tillotson's father lived at Sowerby, near Halifax; a respectable clothier, a decided Puritan, a zealous Calvinist, yet at that time an Episcopalian in practice, for he had his child baptized in the church of his native village, and a gentleman, afterwards Rector of Thornhill, stood godfather. When this little boy came to be Archbishop, his Puritan parentage, and the fact of his father being a Baptist, occasioned reproach; it was said that he had never been baptized in any way, and a preacher before the House of Commons, after Tillotson's elevation to the Primacy, is supposed to have alluded to the rumour, when he declared, with more absurdity than wit, that there were fathers of the Church who never were her sons. The register of Sowerby, however, sets that question at rest, showing that he was baptized in the parish church; and another moot point touching Tillotson's ecclesiastical life, namely, whether he was ever episcopally ordained, is now also settled; it appears he received ordination from a Scotch Bishop—the Bishop of Galloway.\*

\* Grub's "Ecclesiastical History of Scotland," III. 188. Birch's "Tillotson" (2nd Edition), 18, 387.

Educated at Cambridge under the Commonwealth by Puritan tutors, he afterwards became identified with the Latitudinarian school of Divines, but in 1661 we find him amongst the Presbyterians, preaching a morning exercise at Cripplegate. He certainly conformed in 1662, and that fact itself implies his submission to Episcopal ordination. At an early period he attained celebrity as a preacher, although he read his sermons, and never was able to preach without a manuscript. He was successively Curate at Cheshunt; Rector of Ketton, or Kedington, in the County of Suffolk; preacher at Lincoln's Inn; Tuesday Lecturer at St. Lawrence, Jewry; and Canon and Dean of Canterbury. After the Revolution he accepted the Deanery of St. Paul's, and his position in reference to public affairs at that juncture has been noticed already; here it will be sufficient to trace the steps by which he reached the highest position in the Church of England. In some way Tillotson had become a personal favourite with the Prince of Orange, and had been desired to preach before him at St. James's, soon after his arrival in London. Burnet interested himself zealously on the Dean's behalf; but, beyond personal grounds, the popularity of this Divine as a preacher, his eminent abilities, his opposition to the policy of the late King, his liberal politics, his desire for Comprehension, his conciliatory temper, and his moderation in ecclesiastical affairs, recommended him to the new Sovereign as fitted to occupy the post vacated by Sancroft. The very day Tillotson kissed hands on his appointment to the Deanery in September, 1689, the King told him, in reply to his thanks for an office which had set him at ease for the rest of his life, that this was no great matter, for his services would soon be needed in the

highest office of the Church.\* In February, 1690, William pressed upon Tillotson the acceptance of the Primacy; of his extreme reluctance to accept it there can be no doubt; his conversation with his Royal Master, his correspondence with Lady Rachel Russel, and his own private memoranda, prove that if ever a man honestly said *Nolo Episcopari*, Tillotson did. What he wrote within a year afterwards shows that to him the archiepiscopal throne was a bed, not of roses, but of thorns. The *congré d'élire* was issued May the 1st, and his consecration followed on Whit-Sunday at St. Mary-le-Bow, when the congregation included some of the principal Whig nobility, and his progress along Cheapside was an ovation amidst crowds who admired his eloquence and his liberality.

He took possession of Lambeth Palace in November, 1691, having first repaired the building, altered the windows, wainscoted the rooms, and erected a large apartment for his wife, he being one of the earliest Archbishops living there in lawful wedlock. With congratulations from friends there came insults from foes. Arian, Socinian, Deist, Atheist, were titles bestowed on his Grace; and in allusion to the doubts respecting his baptism, he received the nickname of *Undipped John*. His manner of bearing such treatment showed his proficiency in the Christian virtues of patience and meekness. One day, when he was conversing with a gentleman, a servant brought in a sealed packet containing a mask. The Archbishop smiled, and said, "This is a gentle rebuke, if compared with some others in black and white," pointing to papers lying on the table. A bundle of letters, found after his death, exhibited a memorandum in his own

\* "Life of Tillotson," 223.

handwriting, “These are libels. I pray God forgive them ; I do.”\*

It is interesting to leave Lambeth and follow Sancroft into his retirement. He left the Metropolis, never to see it again, in August, 1691, for Fresingfield, a village in Suffolk, where his family had been settled for generations, where his ancestors lay buried in the parish church, and where he himself had been born and baptized. He went down at harvest-time, the sweet air and quiet of the place being, as he said, so preferable to the smoke and noise of London. Presently we find him busy in building a new house, reckoning up the time it would take to daub and tile it, to clothe and cover it in, amidst the dews and mists which might be expected to begin by St. Bartholomew’s Day, then at hand. He complains of being weakly, and describes himself as eating bread-and-butter in a morning, and “superbibing a second dish of coffee after it;” waiting to see what that, and time, and native air would do for his health. He wished to shut out the world, and said, he sometimes felt like a dead man out of mind : old friends dropped off, and tales of sorrow aroused his sympathies, yet he seems, on the whole, to have spent a pleasant time down in Suffolk, although those who disliked his nonjuring principles did what they could to plague his peace. He was reported to be engaged with some of his brethren in plots for the restoration of the exiled Monarch ; and Sprat, Bishop of Rochester, came under suspicion of the same offence.† In the end, these charges of conspiracy proved to be abominable fabrications. Other Nonjurors were suspected of treasonable intrigues, and Dean Hickes fell into great

\* “Life of Tillotson,” 340, 341.

† D’Oyley’s “Life of Sancroft,” II. 25.

trouble. Dr. Bryan about the same time heard that a warrant had been issued for his apprehension, on account of his having written "flat treason."

Sancroft, who escaped arrest because Sprat, when confronted with his accusers, exposed their falsehoods, seems to have been still more annoyed a few months before by a different accusation. "The spirit of calumny, the persecution of the tongue, dogs me even into this wilderness. Dr. Lake, of Garlick Hill, and others, have (as I am informed) filled your city with a report that I go constantly to this parish church, and pray for I know not whom, nor how, and receive the Holy Sacrament; so that my cousin had something to do to satisfy even my friends that it was quite otherwise."\* The fallen Primate's intense dislike to the Establishment, as bitter as could be manifested by any virulent Dissenter, here bursts out in unmistakable fashion. The feeling remained as a sort of monomania to the day of his death. It kept him from setting foot over the threshold of a parish church, and led him to frame an instrument by which he appointed Lloyd, the deprived Bishop of Norwich, his Vicar in all ecclesiastical matters,† and inaugurated a voluntary and schismatical Episcopalian Church. At the end of the year 1691 he removed into his new house, and on New Year's Day at family worship he officiated himself, "in a very cold room where there never was a fire." He would not employ a Chaplain. The preparation and arrangement of Laud's MSS. for the press, occupied a good deal of his time, after which, in the month of November, 1693, his end approached. "It

\* "Life of Sancroft," II. 20.

† The instrument, which is very curious, is given by D'Oyley, "Life of Sancroft," II. 31.

touched my spirits extremely," says Mr. North, who visited him, "to see the low estate of this poor old saint; and with what wonderful regard and humility he treated those who visited him, and particularly myself." His pious ejaculations were carefully recorded by his friends, and we are glad to find him saying to a visitor, "You and I have gone different ways in these late affairs, but I trust heaven's gates are wide enough to receive us both. What I have done, I have done in the integrity of my heart." The approach of mortality expands human charity, yet the ruling passion may be strong in death. Hence, though the dying man felt kindly towards all, he insisted that only Nonjurors should read prayers by his bedside, or officiate at his funeral. He entreated that God would bless and preserve His poor suffering Church, which by the Revolution had been almost destroyed; that he would bless and preserve the King, Queen, and Prince, and in His due time restore to them their undoubted rights.\* Sancroft had an active but narrow intellect, a playful but feeble imagination, a careful but perverted judgment. Living in a narrow circle, his prejudices were strong; and bitter memories of Presbyterian oppression at Cambridge followed him to the grave. His nature was not destitute of affection and generosity, and he seems not to have been morose; he was simple in his living, rather than ascetic in his temper. By no means a Ritualist, he decidedly opposed Romanism, though his sentiments were what would be called decidedly High Church. Of his conscientiousness, honesty, and self-denial, the sacrifice of the Primacy is a sufficient proof; and of his obstinacy, his conduct

\* D'Oyley's "Life of Sancroft," II. 43, 58, 62, 64.

after leaving Lambeth, and his persistency in non-juring habits, afford abundant evidence.

Tillotson survived his predecessor little more than twelve months. He did not occupy his See long enough to accomplish much either as Bishop or Primate. In neither capacity has he left any memorials. No injunctions from him appear in the Archiepiscopal Register, and his biographer makes no mention of his visitations. We are told that he convened an assembly of Bishops at Lambeth, when they agreed with him upon certain regulations, which remained at his death unpublished, as he preferred they should appear with Royal as well as Episcopal authority. His biographer furnishes a list of his deeds, which form but a meagre total for a primacy of even two years and a half, when so much needed to be done. From what we know of him, I should judge that the deficiency of results during his episcopate is to be attributed more to the difficulties of the times and the inconvenience of circumstances, than to want of ability or absence of devotedness. He was seized, in the Chapel at White-hall, with paralysis on the 18th of November, 1694; and though the fit crept over him slowly, he would not call for assistance, lest he should disturb Divine worship. His death occurred on the 22nd, at the age of sixty-five. His character, as compared with Sancroft's, has been differently viewed by enemies and friends. Nonjurors said that his predecessor devised no project for revolutionizing the Church, implying that Tillotson did ; that his predecessor was no Latitudinarian, more than insinuating that Tillotson was ; and when they spoke of Sancroft as a true Father, they meant to affirm that his successor was by no means such. "Intruder," "thief," "robber," "ecclesiastical usurper,"

were epithets fastened on the Archbishop of the Revolution. Burnet, on the other hand, extols him as a faithful friend, a gentle enemy, with a clear head and a tender heart, without superstition in his religion, and, as a preacher, the best of his age. In saying so much, he probably went no further than facts warrant. And I would add, that if Sancroft made a sacrifice in renouncing the Archbishopric, Tillotson, according to his private confessions, made scarcely less sacrifice in accepting it. Intellectually he was a man of eminence ; for Tillotson's writings indicate a rare amount of common sense and of calm judgment, the more remarkable in an age of manifold passions ; and he shows eminent precision and force in stating propositions and arguments, at a time when loose reasoning passed muster. Free from Puritan stiffness, and what many would call Puritan enthusiasm, free also from that academical affectation which had so long offended pure taste, his published sermons are couched in the language of common life, and people must have felt a strange pleasure at hearing from the pulpit, language such as they heard at their own fireside. He seems to have aimed at that which ought to be the object of every Christian preacher, to translate the truths of the Gospel into forms of thought and utterance suited to the age in which he lived. He could be earnest and even vehement in the inculcation of truth and duty ; and never would he be more acceptable to a large class of his hearers than when, with tact and warmth, he exposed the errors of Popery, an opportunity for doing which he rarely, if ever, missed. His habit, too, of insisting upon the reasonableness of almost everything he taught would coincide with the current which had strongly set in against the enforcement of morality

and religion on grounds of authority. A reaction had arisen against the authority of the Church, of the Fathers, of the Schoolmen, and of the Reformers; consequently, sermons filled with quotations and appeals to great names were no longer in request. Even Scripture came to be less favourably used in the way of exclusive authority, than in the way of addition to the force of reasoning. Texts were with many not so much corner-stones, as pillars and buttresses. Tillotson made a large use of Scripture, but the common key-note with him was the reasonableness of the doctrines he laid down. I should suppose that his appearance, his voice, and his manner in the pulpit,—the fact of what he was, as well as the circumstance of what he said, and that indefinable something which contributes so much to a speaker's popularity,—added immensely to the impressiveness of his elocution. There is for modern readers nothing attractive in his style. I know scarcely any other popular sermons so hard to read. Some are exceedingly dry and uninteresting. From natural temperament he lacked what is signified by the word *unction*. He has no strokes of pathos, and the spirit of his theology adds to the defect, by depriving his sermons, to some extent, of that light and beauty, that tenderness and power, which proceed from a clear insight into the deepest spiritual wants of humanity, and the supply made for them in the unsearchable riches of Christ. Wit was not wanting amongst Tillotson's gifts. "I hate a fanatic in lawn sleeves," cried one of his detractors—"I hate a knave in any sleeves," replied the Prelate. He said South "wrote like a man, but bit like a dog;" and when South replied, "he would rather bite like a dog, than fawn like one," Tillotson rejoined, "that for his part he

would choose to be a spaniel rather than a cur.”\* Sancroft was a Tory. Tillotson, through the discipline of the Revolution, had cast off the last remnant of the doctrine which he unfortunately inculcated at the time of Russell’s execution. Tillotson had by his Puritan birth, childhood, and education, imbibed feelings which he never completely lost; and his personal sympathies with those who retained a Puritan creed continued to live in his later days, fostered by friendly intercourse with members of nonconforming communions.

As in our day, so in the days of William the Third, when a vacancy occurred in the See of Canterbury, different names were suggested for its supply. Stillingfleet of Worcester, and Hall of Bristol, were both mentioned, and their merits canvassed, but after the lot had been shaken in the Royal urn, guided by the Queen, it fell upon Thomas Tenison, of Lincoln. He had been a distinguished London clergyman, prominent in opposing Popery and King James. A nobleman, wishing to secure the Lincoln see for some one else, and to prejudice the Queen against Tenison, told Her Majesty that he had delivered a funeral sermon for Nell Gwynn, and had praised that concubine of Charles II. “I have heard as much,” replied Mary: “this is a sign that that poor unfortunate woman died penitent; for if I can read a man’s heart through his looks, had not she made a truly pious and Christian end, the Doctor could never have been induced to speak well of her.”† Tenison’s conduct in the diocese of Lincoln increased the high estimation in which he was held by Mary, and consequently he was nominated to Canterbury on the

\* Birch’s “Tillotson,” 348.

† ‘Memoirs of the Life and Times of Tenison,’ 27.

8th of December, 1694, and confirmed in his election in the Church of St. Mary-le-Bow on the 16th of January, 1695.

Between those two dates, his Royal patroness sickened with the small-pox, three days before Christmas, and died three days afterwards. The Queen was buried in Westminster Abbey, with all the pomp of a purple and gold coffin, banners, and escutcheons, Lords in scarlet and ermine, and Commons in black mantles ; far more interesting than all that, is the following incident, carefully recorded : “A robin redbreast, which had taken refuge in the Abbey, was seen constantly on her hearse, and was looked upon with tender affection for its seeming love to the lamented Queen.”\* Loyalty to William, and sympathy with him in his great loss, were expressed in numerous addresses. A large collection of elegiac poems was published at Cambridge, entitled “*Lacrymæ Cantabrigienses*,” etc., by a list of Dons, some of whom became Bishops ; and the London Clergy vied with each other in their eulogiums—to use the words of a contemporary letter-writer, playing “the fool in their hyperbolical commendation of the Queen, that looks like fulsome flattery, and some expressions bordering upon blasphemy.”† The Presbyterians, headed by Dr. Bates, presented an address of condolence to His Majesty.

The nonjuring Clergy were much excited by the publication of a funeral sermon by Tenison, since it represented the Queen as eminently religious and devout, and gave a full account of her last hours, but said not a word of any repentance for having assumed

\* Stanley’s “Westminster Abbey,” 182.

† Cooper’s “Annals of Cambridge,” IV. 28. Thoresby’s “Diary and Correspondence,” III. 197.

her father's crown, and for the filial impiety considered to be involved in such conduct. A letter to this effect, published in the month of March, 1695, created an intense sensation, being attributed to Bishop Ken. It is printed as his composition in the *Memoirs of Tenison*; but the Layman who wrote Ken's life pronounces it "a tissue of bitter obloquy against the Queen and the Archbishop, wholly inconsistent with the meek spirit of the author of the 'Practice of Divine Love.'" Upon internal grounds he rejects its genuineness. I feel disposed to do the same. Tenison also, it appears, doubted it, but I find no notice of Ken's having disavowed the authorship; and we must not forget how possible it is for an amiable and pious man, under the influence of what he regards as duty, to say things which run counter to the generally calm and quiet current of his life. Tenison's sermon was zealously defended by an anonymous pamphleteer, who included within his defence funeral discourses delivered by other dignitaries; and whilst the press was occupied by this controversy, the friends and agents of James were rejoicing in the death of Mary as endangering the position of William. The Church of England, it was now thought, would be weaned from his cause, by the outburst of his Presbyterian predilections, even to the overthrow of Episcopacy. The ruin of its interests seemed at hand, unless the Revolution could be revolutionized. Ten thousand men, the Jacobite plotters surmised, would suffice for the reconquest of the kingdom, since the Church of England party, who had been for William only on Mary's account, were, it was thought, now entirely alienated from him. The confusion occasioned by her removal was relied upon as a proof of the inclination of the people to see their Stuart

King back at St. James's.\* Some outrageous bursts of Jacobite spleen are noticed in the correspondence of that period. When orders were given that every one should go into mourning for the Queen, some fanatical creature hung up at Tyburn something black, with this inscription, "I mourn because you died not here." At Bristol the bells were rung, and a few mad people danced in the streets to the tune "The King shall enjoy his own again."†

In noticing the deaths of Sancroft, Tillotson, and Mary, we have passed over a period marked by one of those silent changes which often elude the notice of historians. The change referred to is connected very closely with religious freedom. We have had frequent occasion to notice restrictions on the liberty of the press. It is not necessary to go back further than 1662, when Lord Clarendon's Act for licensing books was passed. The Act proscribed the printing and selling of heretical, schismatical, blasphemous, seditious, and treasonable publications. Nothing was to appear contrary to the Christian faith, or the doctrines or discipline of the Church of England. Books on law required a license from the Lord Chancellor or the Lord Chief Justices; books of history, a license from the Secretaries of State; books of divinity and philosophy, a license from the Archbishop of Canterbury. The folly of such restrictions needs no comment. The Act now noticed was made to be in force for two years. It was then continued. In 1685 it was re-enacted for seven years. It continued through the Revolution; and in 1692 was renewed under the Tories for two years more. At four different times, from 1694 to 1698, attempts

\* Macpherson's "Original Papers," I. 509, 520.

† "Hist. MSS. Com.," V. 372.

were made in Parliament to prepare new Bills for licensing printing presses, and the Whigs on one occasion seemed on the point of following the example of their political rivals. Movement in the old direction went so far once, that a restrictive Bill passed the Lords and was read in the Commons, to be thrown out on a second reading. Church and State thus narrowly missed being shackled again in the exercise of rights ever precious to enlightened humanity; and the year 1694, though unmarked in history, is illustrious in fact through the melting away for ever of a long-continued and mischievous licensing law. Not, however, as we shall presently see, that all legislative interference with the publishers of opinions then terminated; but a great obstacle vanished out of the path to that wide intellectual liberty which as a nation we now enjoy.

Tillotson, shortly before his death, as already related, was engaged with his Episcopal brethren in drawing up certain ecclesiastical regulations to be issued on their authority, but which he afterwards felt would be more effective if published in the King's name. Shortly after Tenison's accession to the Archiepiscopate, injunctions were sent forth by Royal command, touching points exactly of the nature indicated to have been discussed in prior Episcopal meetings at Lambeth. On considering the time of their appearance, I have no doubt the new Archbishop adopted the draft of his predecessor. It appeared in the form of a Royal proclamation, recommending care in conferring orders, condemning pluralities and non-residence, and urging upon Bishops to watch over their Clergy, and promote, through them, the celebration of Sacraments, the visitation of the sick, and the catechetical instruction of the

young.\* The grounds upon which Tillotson and Tenison arrived at the determination to seek Church reform under cover of Royal authority, do not appear; but the proclamations indicate that, at the time, the chief spiritual rulers of the land must have had high views of regal prerogatives. If since Elizabeth's Reformation the title of *Head of the Church* had not been legally employed, all which that title could be taken to mean, Tillotson and Tenison were ready to concede; and what is a little curious, in making this concession they could find a precedent in the acts of Archbishop Laud under Charles I.

A circular from the Archbishop, addressed to each of his suffragan Bishops, followed on the 16th of July, 1695; and in it, without referring to the Royal communication made in the month of February, he specifies a number of particulars which had been considered by him, and such of his brethren as were at the time in or near London. These particulars relate to the public reading in church of the Act against profane cursing and swearing, and to catechetical instruction; they relate also to a number of subjects connected with temporalities, such as the prevention of Simoniacal covenants, the better payment of curates, dilapidations, glebe lands, surrogates, and the removal of clergymen from one diocese to another. The employment of proper care in examinations for orders is, however, enforced at length, and each Bishop is urged to lay it upon the conscience of the candidate, to observe such fasting as is prescribed upon Ember-days, and to give himself to meditation and prayer. It is worth noticing that the third of the injunctions calls attention to the 55th canon, which enjoins the bidding of prayer for the

\* "Memoirs of Tenison," 42-47.

King before sermon ; "it being commonly reported," says the Archbishop, "that it is the manner of some in every diocese either to use the Lord's Prayer (which the canons prescribe as the conclusion of the prayer, and not the whole prayer) or at least, to leave out the King's titles, and to forbear to pray for the Bishops as such."\* Plainly there existed disaffection towards existing power in Church and State. Jacobites and Nonjurors troubled the British Israel, and manifested their feelings in the House of God. A new species of Non-conformity was eating its way into the hearts of Englishmen.

The Archbishop of Canterbury was in the month of May nominated as first of the Lords Justices of England for the administration of public affairs during His Majesty's absence in Holland and Flanders. Like Richard Cœur de Lion, like the three Edwards, like the fifth Henry, William of Orange was a man of war from his youth, and his military vocation led him, as it led them, away from the peaceful duties of home government. As they at the head of steel-clad knights and sturdy bowmen marched over the Tweed or through Normandy, Picardy, and Poitou ; as they led Crusaders to fight battles at Jaffa, Askelon, and Jerusalem, so did he who now swayed the English sceptre, carry his troops over into the Netherlands to bear the brunt of the Landen fight, or recover the strongholds of Namur. When William had been abroad before in the life-time of Mary, she ruled as Queen Consort, rendering a special regency needless ; now that she slept in her grave, it was necessary that representatives appointed by the Crown should during the Royal

\* "Memoirs of Tenison," 54-59. This circular letter is not in Wilkins' "Concilia."

absence govern the threefold realm. Churchmen in ancient times had held the highest offices in the State, and had been the Prime Ministers of Kings. Whilst Richard I. was pining in captivity on his return from Palestine, Archbishop Hubert Walter acted as Chief Justiciary of the kingdom ; and whilst the not less brave, but more prudent, Henry V. was winning laurels at Agincourt, Archbishop Chicheley took his place at the head of the Council-Board. After the Reformation, Churchmen, though of diminished influence, appeared in high political positions ; but after the blow struck at the Church by the Long Parliament, no ecclesiastic occupied any important State office until the reign of William III. Upon this new turn in the wheel, came the restoration of high civil authority to ecclesiastical hands. At the same moment, the Church appeared submissive to the State, and the State appeared in submission to the chief ruler of the Church. The former kind of submission was real, the latter only apparent. It is difficult to say who in the month of May, 1695, was Prime Minister ; as the Duke of Leeds, who had headed the late administration, just then, though still nominally President of the Council, lay prostrate in disgrace, and his name is omitted in the list of those who held the Regency. The Whigs were recovering power, and with the seven members of that party who were commissioned to act in the Royal name, there appeared but one Tory. William himself always acted as Minister of Foreign Affairs whether he was at home or abroad, and during his absence from England on this occasion probably the management of domestic business principally rested with Somers and Shrewsbury. The Archbishop, as standing next to the Royal family, took precedence in the Commis-

sion, but the actual power which he exercised must not be measured by that circumstance.

On the 10th of October William returned, after having had the satisfaction of seeing a Marshal of France surrender to the allies the Castle of Namur. The sound of bells from every steeple, the twinkling, for in those days it could hardly be a glare, of lights in every window, and street-crowds rending the air with hurrahs, welcomed the victor as he passed through London to his favourite residence at Kensington. Speedily afterwards he made a Royal progress, and visited Newmarket, where, on Sunday, October the 20th, the Vice-Chancellor, accompanied by the principal members of the University of Cambridge, in all their sedate magnificence, waited on His Majesty, and delivered a congratulatory speech. The usual kissing of hands and assurances of favour wound up the ceremony. He also visited Oxford, where he had been unpopular; but now, if we are to judge by the reception prepared, we should conclude the tide had turned; for Latin orations, musical concerts, and a splendid banquet were all arranged in honour of his presence. However, he would stay in the beautiful city only a few hours, excusing himself on the ground that he had seen the Colleges before. He had no admiration for Oxford, and Oxford had no admiration for him; and between the two no love was lost, when he drove off in his lumbering coach on the road to London.

Just then, a money panic struck not only the commercial classes, but the whole community. The currency sank into such a state, that owing to the wear and tear of coin, and the ingenious arts of clippers, neither the gentleman who paid his guinea nor the peasant who received his shilling, knew exactly

what the piece of gold or silver happened to be worth. The subject came up in sermons, and preachers deplored the low state of public morality. Fleetwood, preaching before the Lord Mayor of London in the month of December, deplored that “a soft pernicious tenderness slackened the care of magistrates, kept back the under officers, corrupted the juries, and withheld the evidence ;” and one of the clergy connected with the Cathedral of York, when addressing some clippers who were to be hanged next day, dwelt on the insensibility of culprits of that class to the heinousness of their crime. Exactly at the time when this monetary question had thrown everybody into a state of embarrassment, a theological controversy added to the excitement of religious people. It may be premised that the controversy indicates a new position of Christian thought. The question raised did not relate to predestination, to the nature of Christ’s death, the extent of its efficacy and application, but to the mode of the Divine existence. It showed a retreat back to inquiries akin to such as agitated the Nicene Age. Battles about grace, election, and free-will had been fought out ; the human mind now ranged over other fields. Theological discussion is determined in a great degree by circumstances, idiosyncracies, friendships, and associations ; but the spirit of an age is also a mighty force, acting with, and acting through all other influences. And it is not a little remarkable, that as the revival of the study of philosophy in the Christian schools of Alexandria was followed by controversies respecting the Divine nature, so the revival of the study of a similar philosophy at Cambridge was followed by a similar result. Whereas the logic, ethics, and politics of Aristotle have affinity with questions relating to

Divine government, the speculations of Plato connect themselves more with questions as to the Divine Being Himself. Accordingly, the Aristotelian logicians of the Middle Ages, the Reformation, and the Commonwealth, dwelt much upon predestination, justification, and atonement ; and the philosophical Divines of the Revolution, trained more in Platonic culture, devoted themselves to questions respecting the Trinity and the Person of Christ. At the time of the Revolution, Unitarian principles in England were on the advance, both as to explicitness of statement and extent of currency. According to the Toleration Act, Antitrinitarians were as much precluded from publicly celebrating worship after the Revolution, as Presbyterians and others had been before ; yet, by the close of the 17th century, it is said, Unitarian meeting-houses were erected. Some Presbyterians, perhaps, rather of an Arian than of a Socinian type, at that period diverged from orthodox paths ; but it is stated that on the whole these opinions "were more prevalent in the Church than among the Dissenters."\* If, said some, Christ be God, none can be greater than He, yet He says, "The Father is greater than I." If Jesus Christ were truly God, they alleged, it would be blasphemy to call Him the sent of God ; heedless of the allegation, on the other side, that if He were simply man, it would be blasphemy to ascribe to Him Divine names, attributes, and honours. Arguments were also adduced against the doctrine of the Personality and Divinity of the Holy Ghost. A violent attack also was made, in a distinct publication, on the character of Athanasius, with the object of damaging the theological belief

\* "Antitrinitarian Biography," I. 252, 316; Tayler's "Religious Life in England," 229.

which that great Father of the Church so zealously upheld. Books of this description, vindicating opinions under a legal ban, excited the indignation both of Church and Parliament. A work, written by Dr. Bury, a Divine of the Latitudinarian school, led to his being deprived of the Rectorship of Lincoln College, Oxford, and a vote was passed by the Commons dooming to the flames an attack on the doctrine of the Trinity, and imposing on the author a fine of £500.\*

Dr. Wallis, the Savilian professor of Geometry, wrote a pamphlet † on the doctrine of the Trinity, and in this singular production employed some of the strangest expressions and illustrations with regard to the mystery that were ever conceived. "What is it," he asks, "that is pretended to be impossible? 'Tis but this, that there be three *somewhats*, which are but one God, and these *somewhats* are called Persons." To explain the Trinity in unity, he compares the Almighty to a *cube*, with its length, breadth, and height infinitely extended. The length, breadth, and height of the cube, he says, are equal, and they are the equal sides of one substance, a fair resemblance of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. This *longum, latum, profundum*, such are his words, is one cube of three dimensions, yet but one body; and this Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are three Persons, and yet one God. Vain attempts were made by the early Fathers to give definite conceptions of the mode of the Divine existence; but in this respect Wallis attained to an originality as unenviable as it was startling; and were it not for his known candour and piety, it might

\* "Journals," January 3, 1694.

† The pamphlet is entitled, "The Doctrine of the Blessed Trinity, briefly Explained in a Letter to a Friend," 4to.

be supposed he intended to turn orthodoxy into ridicule.

Sherlock, now in the black books of High Churchmen, undertook to meet the new attacks upon the Trinity ; and, as so much was made of the assumed unreasonableness of that doctrine, he commenced his vindication of it with an elaborate argument to prove that it involves no contradiction whatever. His notion was, that self-consciousness constitutes the numerical unity of a Spiritual Being, that, in the three Persons of the Trinity, there is what may be called a common self-consciousness, and that therefore these three Persons are essentially one. After working out an abstruse argument to this effect, and endeavouring to show there is authority in some of the Fathers for his theory, he concludes by taking up, *seriatim*, certain objections which had been urged in recent Unitarian writings. Joseph Bingham, a scholar of surprising erudition, destined to throw a world of light upon the antiquities of the Christian Church ; in a sermon and preface which he published, made a distinction between the patristic and the scholastic doctrines of the Trinity, maintaining that Luther, in his theology on that point, followed in the wake of the Fathers, whilst Calvin trod in the steps of the Schoolmen. The Lutheran, the Patristic, and the Scripture doctrine, in Bingham's estimation, amounted to this, that there are three individual substances in the Godhead, *really and numerically* distinct from each other, though at the same time One in another sense.\* Sherlock appealed to reason ; Bingham, a recluse, scarcely touched by habits of thought outside his University, appealed to tradition ; and his

\* Bingham's "Works," VIII. 292, 319, 320.

piece of hard, dry learning, without the slightest tincture of pathos, or a single practical remark from beginning to end, must have proved a repulsive lesson even to an Oxford audience. Sherlock being personally disliked, no hornet's nest could be worse than attacks which he aroused. South used his sledge-hammer with unmerciful violence. Not unlearned, not unversed in logic, he was more of a rhetorician than a philosopher, more of a wit than a Divine. After denouncing Sherlock's explication as wholly inconsistent with the mysteriousness of the subject, and representing his exceptions to the use of certain words in relation to it as false, groundless, and impudent, he exposed, with tremendous ridicule, the theory of mutual consciousness. He maintained that Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are not distinct infinite minds or spirits, that to say they are so, is to contradict Councils, Fathers, Schoolmen, and later Divines; that Sherlock's book contained philosophical paradoxes and grammatical mistakes; and that the author was insolent, scornful, and proud beyond all parallel. No doubt there is much force in some of South's augments, but he was much stronger as a destructive than as an architect, and when he attempted to define a notion of the Trinity, he failed, as all had done who went before him. Nor could he escape the infection of a most infelicitous, if not a decidedly irreverent, habit of illustrating theological mysteries. Wallis had written of *three somewhats*, and of a *Divine cube* of infinite dimensions. Sherlock had propounded a theory of Divine *mutual-consciousness*; and now South came forward with the idea, that the distinctions in the Godhead are *modes, habitudes, and affections* of the Divine substance, such in spiritual and immaterial

beings as *posture* is to the human body.\* How an anxious searcher after truth can be helped by such methods I cannot imagine; and even when South's reasoning is forcible, he is ever interrupting it with flashes of wit; so that throughout one feels, what is fatal to all religious instruction, namely, that the polemic is more anxious about victory than about truth. His attack on Sherlock was deemed by contemporaries a decided success; but when South charged him with Tritheism, he charged him with what Sherlock himself utterly denied. The fact is, no man can attempt a logical explanation of the Godhead without being in danger of Tritheism on the one side, or Sabellianism on the other. In such controversies we notice the frequent use of some word not in Scripture, but considered to be an equivalent for what is Scripture, a term conceived to be a concentration of diffused truth, the quintessence of a doctrine previously in a state of solution. Unfortunately such words are differently understood by different parties. The same proposition thus becomes to two different minds entirely different things, and the utmost confusion is the consequence. Theories to explain facts are confounded with the facts themselves, and a man who only denies a particular theory, is charged with denying the fact to which the theory relates. It should be added that in the end, Sherlock's statements were more cautious than at the beginning; for he came to admit that the phrases, *minds*, *spirits*, *substances*, which he had so freely used, needed great care for their employment, and were liable to be taken

\* South's "Animadversions," 240, and "Considerations on the Explications of the Doctrine of the Trinity, etc., written to a Person of Quality," 1693.

in an heretical sense. The two combatants did but follow divergent tendencies of thought and action existing before the Council of Nicæa — tendencies which that Council sought to check and harmonize. Sherlock followed in the wake of Tertullian, Novatian, Hippolytus, and Origen, whose inquiries mainly pointed to *distinctions* in the Godhead. South trod in the footsteps of Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, Irenæus, and Clement of Alexandria, who leaned towards Monarchianism, and were jealous of any dishonour done to the Divine Unity.

Of course Unitarians, as they stood by, watched the conflict with eager curiosity, striving to turn it to their own account. They labelled Sherlock's theory as the Cartesian; South's as the Aristotelian. They connected the former scheme with the philosophy of Realism, and the latter scheme with that of Nominalism. With regard to speculations which had been woven around the teaching of Scripture, there was ground for the nomenclature; but it really forms another instance of the confusion of thought produced when critics identify metaphysical theories with simple conclusions drawn from Scripture, as expressed in the grand old words, "The Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God, and yet there are not three Gods, but one God."

Howe took part in the dispute, and has been supposed by some to have advocated Sherlock's side. But it seems that he counted the opinion expressed by Sherlock as one theory for obviating objections to a fact, whilst another theory might be held in perfect consistency with sincere faith in the truth to which both theories apply. In his "Calm and Sober Inquiry concerning the Possibility of a Trinity in the God-

head," the utmost he asserts is, that such a mode of triune existence as Sherlock attributes to the Divine Being is *possible*, and to his mind the most reasonable; but he did not think another hypothesis of a different kind altogether indefensible. He considered that different hypotheses are at hand not fully to elucidate the mode of the Divine existence, but to obviate objections, by showing that a threefold distinction can be imagined, so as not to involve any contradiction whatever.

Amidst this war of words, in which reason and tradition had a share, secular authority interfered. On the 3rd of January, 1694, the Lords spiritual and temporal ordered their Majesties' Attorney-General to prosecute the author and printer of an infamous and scandalous libel, entitled, "A Brief but Clear Confutation of the Doctrine of the Trinity." This was a State condemnation of Unitarianism, and the same year a tract printed by the Unitarian Society was seized by authority, and the writer apprehended. On the 25th of November, 1695, the Vice-Chancellor and Heads of Houses at Oxford decreed it to be false, impious, and heretical, to say that there are three infinite, distinct minds and substances in the Trinity, or that the three Persons are three distinct, infinite minds or spirits. Bingham resigned his fellowship, and withdrew from the University; but others, who thought with him, asserted, that what the Heads of Oxford had condemned as heretical, really expressed the Catholic faith. Sherlock declared "that he would undertake, any day in the year, to procure a meeting of twice as many wise and learned men to censure their decree."\* In connection with this state of things there appeared in February, 1696, certain royal injunctions which

\* "Ben Mordecai's Letters," I. 70, quoted in Toulmin, 182.

prohibited every preacher from delivering any other doctrine concerning the Blessed Trinity than what is contained in the Holy Scriptures, and is agreeable to the three Creeds and the Thirty-nine Articles ; and they also strictly charged the right reverend fathers to make use of their authority for repressing the publication of books against that doctrine.

Charles II. had in 1662 commanded the Clergy to avoid “the deep points of election and reprobation, together with the incomprehensible manner of the concurrence of God’s free grace and man’s free will.” He thus claimed a high spiritual authority over the Ministers of religion, but it was by removing certain topics from within the range of discussion. William III. now enjoined the positive inculcation of a particular doctrine, and no other. He did not on his own authority define the doctrine, but only referred to the doctrine authorized in the Creeds and Articles recognized by the Established Church ; indeed, he did not go beyond the terms employed in the sixteenth clause of the Toleration Act ;\* yet it must be confessed that altogether he appears as a still more definite theological censor than Charles II. And it is worth notice that in this respect he not only assumed a supreme Headship over the Established Church, but he also claimed to rule the Free Churches of England, for he commanded that no “preacher whatsoever, in his sermon or lecture, should presume to deliver any other doctrine concerning the Trinity than that defined in the Creeds and Articles.” When we weigh the words

\* That clause excepts from the Act “any person that shall deny in his preaching or writing the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity, as it is declared in the aforesaid Articles of Religion,” i.e. the XXXIX. Articles.

employed, we are astonished to find the constitutional King of the Revolution, the Prince who came to deliver the consciences of Englishmen from the despotism of James and the tyranny of Rome, binding upon the Ministers of religion one precise and rigid form of expression as to the most profound of all theological mysteries. What makes this fact still more curious, and the conduct in question still more unreasonable, is that the most learned men in the Church at that very crisis were unable to decide amongst themselves what was the doctrine of her formularies, Sherlock declaring it to be one thing and South another.

Although it is true of ancient times and Oriental states, that “where the word of a King is, there is power,” the King’s word amongst Englishmen at the time, especially upon religious subjects, carried with it no weight whatever; and although the controversy raging when the injunctions were devised soon burnt out, the heresies assailed lingered on, and in 1698 the Commons appealed to His Majesty for a proclamation for suppressing pernicious books containing doctrines opposed to the Holy Trinity, and other fundamental articles of the Christian faith.\* The King, not choosing to do this, gave his faithful Commons a short answer, promising attention to the subject, and wishing that provision could be made for the purpose desired; but, however, a proclamation was immediately issued for preventing and punishing immorality and profaneness. Not long before this, a youth of only eighteen years of age was executed in the city of Edinburgh for blasphemy, a victim to the zeal of the Presbyterian Clergy;† and, about the same time, the orthodox

\* “Parl. Hist.” V. 1172. February 9, 1698.

† There is a full account of this horrible affair in Arnot’s “State Trials,” xiii.

Dissenters of England, in an address of theirs, most inconsistently urged His Majesty to deprive Unitarians of the liberty of the Press.

By an Act passed in 1698, Parliament united its authority with that of the Sovereign in the support of orthodox opinions, without perceiving the futility of such methods of defending the Gospel ; and it is not a little surprising that such a man as Calamy, both in his "Diary" and in his "Historical Addition to Baxter's Life and Times," passes by the objectionable enactment ; indeed, so entirely unaffected by its injustice does he appear to have been, that, in the latter work, he tells us, in the year 1698, Parliament "did not meddle with matters of religion, though they had a committee for religion as usually."\* Nothing could more decidedly prove how much even the advocates of religious liberty had yet to learn touching that very object which they were supposed to understand, and were sincerely anxious to promote. It is a pleasure to be able to add, that neither at the time, nor afterwards, so far as can be ascertained, did this Act take any effect ; and, apparently, it remained a dead letter until its repeal in the year 1813.

\* Calamy's "Abridgment," 561.

## CHAPTER VI.

JAMES, after his defeat on the banks of the Boyne, did not relinquish the hope of recovering his crown. In 1692, amidst preparations for a descent on the shores of England, he issued a Declaration, in which he promised to maintain the rights of the Established Church ; but as for his past conduct, he had nothing to retract, nothing to deplore ; and as to his future course, he held out no hopes that he would rule otherwise than he had been doing. Not only were all who should resist his new attempt to expect his vengeance, but whole classes of persons, amounting to some thousands, who had incurred his displeasure, were threatened with punishment. High in the list of culprits excluded from mercy, stood Tillotson and Burnet. Such a manifesto, of course, did the Exile's cause more harm than good ; and, therefore, in 1693, he reluctantly published another, pitched in a different key, promising an amnesty to those who would submit, and to all his subjects the restoration of Parliaments, the preservation of the Test Act, and a limitation of the dispensing power. These concessions were as tardy and ineffectual as they were insincere. "After all," said one who was in the confidence of James, "the object of this Declaration is only to get us back to England. We

shall fight the battle of the Catholics with much greater advantage at Whitehall than at St. Germain.\*

Within the gloomy courts and chambers of the old Palace of St. Germain—which in melancholy stateliness furnishes such a contrast to the cheerful prospect from its windows—James, with his Court of blinded partizans and his crowds of Jesuit priests, was aiming to convert certain English Protestants who had followed his unhappy fortunes, and was planning his return to the land of his fathers, with the hope of reconciling an heretical realm to the true Catholic Church. Schemes of insurrection were contrived before the death of Queen Mary; then came schemes for assassination. Previous to that period, the death of William had offered James no augmentation of hopes; afterwards, to clear off the reigning Prince from the stage seemed an advantageous step. That James originated any plot for the murder of his son-in-law cannot be proved, and ought not to be believed; nor can it be shown that he expressly sanctioned anything of the kind; but it can scarcely be questioned that he knew and connived at what was going on. Insurrection and assassination plots together opened up vistas into which the refugees at St. Germain wistfully peered, as they laid their heads together, and talked over the business in retired corners of the shaded alleys, or in secret nooks of the rambling palace galleries. A hundred priests, it is said, were to attend the anointed King in his expedition, carrying precious relics as pledges of victory, including the image of St. Victor, of which the miraculous virtue upon infidels and heretics had been proved, when it was sent as a present to France from the Queen of Poland. So confident of success were

\* Mazure, quoted in Macaulay's "Hist." VII. 15.

the plotters, that they talked of taking debentures on English estates, soon to fall into their hands; also pieces of preferment in Church and State were allotted to Royal favourites, and Jesuits rejoiced in the idea of setting up a branch of their order within the spacious precincts of Chelsea College. These Papists abroad found sympathizing friends at home amongst the Non-jurors, some of whom were at the time charged with preaching from texts suggestive of treason and rebellion.\*

Intrigues did not end in foolish, harmless, and untruthful correspondence. A conspiracy was formed to attack William when driving over a piece of bad road between Brentford and Turnham Green, but the conspirators were betrayed, and the bubble of vengeance immediately burst. Charnock, Keyes, and King, Roman Catholic Jacobites, who, with others of the same faith in religion and politics, had been deeply involved in this affair, suffered for their offence, the last-named declaring at the foot of the gallows, that what he had done was to be attributed to his own sinful passions, not to any Roman Catholic doctrine on the subject of tyrannicide. Two others of higher grade, Sir John Friend, belonging to the Jacobite nonjuring class, and Sir William Parkyns, a Jacobite, but a juror too, on the 3rd of April, also suffered death for their share in the conspiracy. The fate of these knights created immense excitement, chiefly on account of a circumstance which brings their execution before us. Jeremy Collier has been already mentioned as a distinguished nonjuring Divine, and a great sensation was produced in the vast crowds round the fatal tree by the

\* “An Impartial History of the Plots and Conspiracies against William III.,” p. 90. See also Macpherson’s “Original Papers.”

sight of this clergyman, in company with two others less known, named Cooke and Snatt, performing some peculiar religious rite at the last moment of the culprits' lives. The three Divines were observed in the cart, not only praying with the unhappy men, but laying hands upon them as they knelt down, Collier solemnly pronouncing over them the form of absolution, prescribed in the Visitation of the Sick. A paper, professedly written by Friend, and delivered to the Sheriff, contained a prayer for King James' restoration, and stated that the writer was a member of the Church, "though," he adds, "a most unworthy and unprofitable part of it" (meaning the nonjuring part), "which suffers so much at present for a strict adherence to the laws and Christian principles.

For this I suffer, and for this I die."\*

People were astonished at the strange absolution performed. Multitudes more who heard of it shared in the wonder, and the circulation of the paper increased the excitement. To all but the most obstinate, the administering of absolution under the circumstances seemed like an act of sympathy with civil treason, and a gross perversion of Church formularies. London presently rose in a state of high commotion. The Tyburn affair was in everybody's mouth, and broadsides and pamphlets bearing upon it were in everybody's hands. The public authorities interfered, and at once seized Cooke and Snatt. Collier eluded their search; and in some garret, cellar, or other out-of-the-way place, wrote a defence of what he had done. He had, he said, been sent for to Newgate; Sir William Parkyns had begged

\* Lathbury's "Hist. of Nonjurors," 169.

that the absolution of the Church might be pronounced over him in his last moments. Collier had been refused admittance to the prisoner in his cell on the day of execution, and so he went to Tyburn to pronounce absolution there. He used a form in the Prayer-Book ; and as to the imposition of hands, complained of as an innovation, he concluded that it was a very ancient, and, at least, a very innocent ceremony.

The Bishops, considering that a scandal had been brought upon the Church, published a declaration condemnatory both of the culprits' papers and the Clergymen's conduct. They charged the papers with making a favourable mention of so foul a thing as the assassination of His Majesty ; and the Clergymen's conduct they denounced as insolent, and without precedent either in the English Church or in any other. All the Bishops in London signed this document, including Crew of Durham, and Sprat of Rochester, who, from their past career, were still suspected of Jacobite tendencies. Collier, whose boldness equalled his learning, returned to the charge, and from the depths of his obscurity re-proclaimed the doctrine of the imposition of hands as Scriptural, and consonant with patristic teaching. He also pleaded on its behalf, in such a case as the one in question, no less a precedent than the conduct of Bishop Sanderson, oddly enough putting the Prelate in the place of the traitor under the fatal beam. "This eminent casuist," says Collier, "about a day before his death, desired his chaplain, Mr. Pullin, to give him absolution ; and at his performing that office, he pulled off his cap that Mr. Pullin might lay his hand upon his bare head."\* Collier was the leading spirit in this transaction, and he willingly

\* "Answer to Animadversions," 10.

accepted the chief responsibility ; yet he continued to hide himself, and finally escaped the constable's clutches. His two companions, after a true Bill had been found against them by the Grand Jury of Middlesex, were set at liberty.

Charles, Earl of Middleton, took an active part in Jacobite intrigues, and he is worth notice as an example of Jacobitism in alliance with Protestantism, or rather in alliance with views anti-Catholic. He married into a Popish family, but did not adopt their religion. Indeed his principles on that score were very loose, although he knew how, with a clever stroke, to repel the onsets of Jesuitical sophistry. A priest one day tried to prove to him the doctrine of Transubstantiation. "Your Lordship," said he, "believes in the Trinity ;" Middleton stopped him by asking, "Who told you so ?" The priest felt amazed, upon which the Peer added, it was the priest's business to prove that his own belief was true, and not to question another man about his.\* In one of the Earl's furtive missions to England upon the business of the exiled Prince, he had met with the Duke of Shrewsbury, and had evidently tried, in an underhand way, to work his mind into a Jacobite direction. Sir John Fenwick, an active plotter at that time, got hold of this, and had made the most of it against the Duke, who now occupied the office of Secretary of State, and had, during William's absence, discharged, along with the Archbishop of Canterbury and others, the high function of a Lord Justice. A letter which Shrewsbury wrote to William† indicates what strange things went on

\* Burnet's "Own Time," I. 683.

† The letter may be found in the "Record Office," dated Sept. 8, 1696.

behind the scenes, the scrapes men fell into, the way they got out of them, the generosity and forgiving spirit of the King, and the rickety condition of English Protestantism, if it had rested upon nothing better than the character of politicians.

Fenwick disclosed divisions amongst the Nonjurors, classifying them as compounders and non-compounders —the compounders being anxious for some security from King James, that English religion and liberty would be preserved in case of his restoration ; and the non-compounders being prepared to cast themselves entirely upon his honour and generosity. Lloyd, the deprived Bishop of Norwich, adopted the latter view, and would hear of no terms in a matter of Divine right.\*

Fenwick got into most serious trouble, being accused of high treason. The Bill for his attainder created a long discussion in the House of Commons. The discussion took a theological turn as to deficiency of evidence, the testimony of one witness not being backed by the testimony of a second. Much was said by the opponents of the attainder, respecting the eternal law of God and man, and of the Holy Scriptures requiring more witnesses than one to convict a person of a capital crime. “No man,” it was repeated, “shall be condemned to die by the mouth of one witness, but by two or three witnesses he shall suffer.” It was replied, that not the Levitical law, but the law of England, should be guide in such a case ; then, some one rejoined, that he and those who thought with him, did not wish to base their argument simply on Scripture, but upon the fact that this law of Moses

\* The substance of his discoveries is given in Tindal’s “History.”

having been confirmed by our Saviour in the New Testament, it ought to be brought into connection with the law of the land.\* In spite of attempts made to save Sir John, the Bill passed both Houses. Robert Nelson interceded with Tenison to plead with the King. "My very good friend," returned the Primate, "give me leave to tell you, that you know not what spirit this man, nor I am of; I wish for his, nor no man's blood, but how can I do my duty to God and my King, should I declare a man innocent; for my not being of the side of the Bill will convince the world that I think him so, when I am satisfied in my conscience, not only from Goodman's evidence, but all the convincing testimonies in the world, that he is guilty. Laws *ex post facto* may indeed carry the face of rigour with them, but if ever a law was necessary this is."†

After the Bill had passed, efforts were continued on the culprit's behalf. His Lady petitioned the House of Lords and the House of Commons; also she threw herself as a suppliant at William's feet in vain. Fenwick delivered a paper, supposed to have been drawn up by White, the deprived Bishop of Peterborough, in which he did not deny the facts sworn, but only complained of his attainder as unjust; at the same time declaring his loyalty to King James and to the Prince of Wales, but denouncing, with horror, the idea of assassinating William.‡

Fenwick suffered upon Tower Hill the 20th of January, 1697. That wintry morning, cold with storms, White appeared with him on the scaffold, not to pronounce absolution or lay on hands, but simply

\* "Parl. Hist.," V. 1127-1130.

† "Memoirs of Tenison," 62.      ‡ Burnet, II. 193.

to pray with a dying man. Commending the King, meaning James, to the Divine protection, but not using his name, Fenwick as he laid his neck on the block, cried, “Lord Jesus, receive my soul.” His corpse was buried by torch-light in St. Martin’s Church. Others were hanged for treasonable practices, including Cranburne, who professed himself a member of the Church of England; and Rookwood and Lowick, Roman Catholics, whose “*Jesu Maria*” and “*Paternosters*” are particularly mentioned by the Protestant narrator of their last end.\*

The peace of Ryswick, which put an end to the war between William and Louis, and detached the latter from the cause of James, dispelled for a while the visions which had tantalized and disappointed the non-juring party; for the treaty, sanctioned by France, Spain, and the United Provinces, recognized the constitution of England, and William as a constitutional King. Some Clergymen, wearied by the bootless resistance of eight long years, now came to terms, and swore allegiance to the reigning Sovereign, adopting at last the principle which they had denounced, that a settled Government, though illegitimate in its origin, is binding in its authority.

Immense joy arose on this occasion; it prolonged itself during the month of November. The anniversary of the landing at Torbay of course set in motion peals of bells, lighted up candles in windows, kindled bonfires in market-places, and evoked shouts of glee from assembled multitudes. The 14th of November, the day of William’s return and landing at Margate, became an additional season of joy. On the 16th, which turned out a bright morning, he entered his capital in state,

\* “*Impartial History of Plots*,” 176.

attended by the Lord Mayor and Aldermen, with a measure of the splendour which on past occasions brightened the City's dark and narrow streets ; although some of the spectators of the sight noticed a decline in the splendour of the pageantry. The triumph of the day was complete when the University of Oxford, to the unutterable chagrin of the Nonjurors, struck its colours, and in an adulatory address did homage to the hero. This tide of joy flowed into the following month. The 2nd of December was held as a day of thanksgiving for the peace. The King and Court attended Divine service in the Chapel at Whitehall, where Burnet preached, or, as one who heard him says, "made a florid panegyric."\* The same day St. Paul's Cathedral was opened for Divine service, and William would have been there instead of being in his own Chapel, but for fear lest the multitude, thronging the streets, should render his approach almost impracticable. The Corporation of London appeared in their civic pomp ; Compton ascended his throne, just enriched by the carvings of Grinling Gibbons ; and afterwards preached from the appropriate text, "I was glad when they said unto me, Let us go up into the house of the Lord."

A new Parliament, of a decidedly High-Church stamp, assembled on the 9th of December, amidst an atmosphere of hypocrisy and intrigue rarely equalled. A sermon preached before the Commons by the Rector of Sutton in Surrey, upon government originating with the people, and good government alone being the ordinance of God, gave vast offence to the Tories, and occasioned the passing of a curious resolution, that no one should preach before the House unless he was a

\* Evelyn's "Diary," Dec. 2nd.

Dean or a D.D. A Committee of the Lower House formally complained of Dissenters being made Justices of the Peace ; whereas it turned out on inquiry that not two of their number were placed on the roll, besides such as had become occasional Conformists. Some zealots went so far as to propose, that an address should be presented to the King, to remove Burnet from the office of Preceptor to the young Duke of Gloucester ; but as this was too absurd a proposal to find much support, it had to be withdrawn.\* Under pretence of patriotism and economy, a strong opposition party carried one measure for a reduction of the army, which compelled William to part with his Dutch Guards, the sorest sacrifice he ever made ; and another for the recovery of Irish estates, bestowed by the Monarch on his supporters, a proceeding which ended in the aggrandizement of its inventors.

The peace of Ryswick had brought “a great swarm of priests” to England, who held up their heads with so much insolence, that some foolish Protestants and some cunning politicians absurdly declared, the articles of peace favoured Popery, and the King was a Papist in disguise. Soon the new Parliament, stirred by a gust of wind which threatened a “No Popery” tempest, set to work upon a Bill obliging every Popish minor succeeding to an estate, immediately to take the oath of allegiance, and, as soon as he attained his majority, to submit to the Test Act, otherwise his property would devolve on the Protestant next of kin. The Bill also banished Popish priests, and adjudged them to perpetual imprisonment in case they dared to return ; the reward for conviction being £100. The Bill is said to have been partly a trick contrived by

\* Kennet’s “Hist. of England,” III. 777.

the Tories to perplex the Whigs, who prided themselves on being the champions of Toleration ; but when they saw the Whigs supporting it, they indicated a desire to drop the measure. With a view of provoking defeat, they introduced additionally severe and unreasonable clauses ; yet, contrary to their expectations, the Lords, under the influence of an anti-Popish fever, accepted what came up to them, and the Bill, unamended, not only passed the Upper House, but received the Royal assent. Burnet supported it, and endeavoured to defend himself against the charge of injustice and inconsistency. "I had always thought," he says, "that if a Government found any sect in religion incompatible with its quiet and safety, it might, and sometimes ought, to send away all of that sect, with as little hardship as possible. It is certain that as all Papists must, at all times, be ill subjects to a Protestant prince, so this is much more to be apprehended when there is a pretended Popish heir in the case." The new law happily proved a nullity. Some of the terms were so vague, and the provisions were so oppressive, that the "Act was not followed, nor executed in any sort." \*

The power vested in the Crown of nominating Bishops and other dignitaries had been exercised during the life of Queen Mary very much according to her discretion. William, perhaps because he was a foreigner, and also destitute of entire sympathy with Episcopalianism, or because he was so engrossed with foreign affairs, seems to have been reluctant to take part in the bestowment of ecclesiastical patronage. In the year 1700 he devolved its responsibilities, to a large extent, upon the Archbishops of Canterbury and

\* Burnet, II. 229 ; Statutes 11 and 12 Will. III. c. 4.

York, and the Bishops of Salisbury, Worcester, Ely, and Norwich. Whilst he was in the realm they were to signify to him their recommendation of such persons as they thought fit for vacant preferments, which recommendation they were to present through the Secretaries of State. If whilst he was beyond the seas, any Bishoprics, Deaneries, or other specified clerical offices in his gift, above the annual value of £140, should need filling up, the Commissioners were to transmit the names of suitable persons, respecting whom his pleasure would be made known under his sign-manual. At the same time he delegated to them full power at once to appoint to other preferments. Also, he declared, that neither when he was abroad nor when he was at home, should either of his Secretaries address him in reference to any benefices left to the recommendation or disposal of the Commissioners, without first communicating with them ; further that no warrant should be presented for the Royal signature until their recommendation had been obtained.\*

An affecting bereavement now occurred in the Royal family. William, Duke of Gloucester, a son of Princess Anne and Prince George of Denmark, was heir to the throne, and therefore in him centred the hopes of the nation. The education of the Prince early occupied the thoughts of William, who offered the post of Governor to the Duke of Shrewsbury, now restored to the Royal confidence. Shrewsbury declined, and the office fell into the hands of Marlborough. A story is told to the effect, that the King said to the future hero of Blenheim, "Teach him to be what you are, and my nephew cannot want accomplishments." The still more important duties of preceptor to the youth were

\* Le Neve's "Lives," Part I. 247-254.

entrusted to Burnet, as already indicated. Windsor then being within the diocese of Salisbury, the Prince was to live there during the summer months, when the Bishop reckoned he would be in his diocese, and therefore in the way of his proper episcopal duties ; he satisfied himself with thinking, that all would be right if the King allowed him ten weeks in the year for the other parts of his diocese, a circumstance which shows what in those days were the notions of a Bishop's office. After a few days' attack of fever, the young Duke died on the 30th of July. He was buried in Westminster Abbey ; and recently, upon the family vault being opened, amongst the ten small coffins of the children of James II., and the eighteen small coffins of the children of his daughter Anne, lay the coffin of the youthful William, resting in remarkable juxtaposition upon that of Elizabeth of Bohemia.\* Thus one of an unfortunate race, who never attained the crown he inherited, mingled his dust with that of a great aunt, who soon lost the crown she had prompted her husband too eagerly to seize.

The Duke of Gloucester was the last Protestant heir to the Crown recognized in the Act of Settlement. His death therefore exposed the Royal succession to new perils, revived the hopes of the Jacobites, and created anxiety in the minds of William and his Ministers. The King at the time had left England nearly a month ; and as, amidst the gardens of his retreat at Loo, he saw the shortening of the summer days, he had pondered future contingencies, and laid plans for preserving the work which he had wrought. In the following February, 1701, he, bearing evi-

\* Stanley's "Memorials of Westminster Abbey," Supplement, 136.

dent signs of increasing frailty, met Parliament, and told the Houses that the loss just sustained made it necessary there should be a further provision for a Protestant succession : adding, that the happiness of the nation, and the security of religion, seemed to depend so much upon this, that he could not doubt it would meet with general concurrence. The addresses echoed the same sentiment, and in March the Bill of Succession came under Parliamentary debate. It determined that the Princess Sophia, Duchess-Dowager of Hanover, or her heirs, should succeed upon failure of issue to William and Anne ; and it laid down the principle that whosoever wore the Crown should commune with the Church of England, as by law established. Other important resolutions, which it does not come within my province to notice, were incorporated in the Bill ; and these gave rise to fierce discussions between the two great political parties, who, throughout the whole of this reign, were teasing William out of his life, provoking the phlegmatic Dutchman to exclaim, that “all the difference he knew between the two parties was, that the Tories would cut his throat in the morning, and the Whigs in the afternoon.”\* The Act of Settlement at length passed, and received the Royal assent.

It is curious to observe with respect to this Act, that Sophia, who was made the protectress of the Reformed faith, and who was to supersede the Stuarts on the throne, was neither a zealous Protestant nor a foe to the exiled family. For when asked what was the religion of her blooming daughter, at the time just thirteen years of age, she replied she had none as yet ; “we are waiting to know what prince she is to marry,

\* Ralph’s “Hist.,” II. 908.

and whenever that point is determined, she will be duly instructed in the religion of her future husband, whether Protestant or Catholic." And in a communication, which Lord Chancellor Hardwicke called her Jacobite letter, she bewailed the fate of the poor Prince of Wales, who, if restored, she said, might be easily guided in a right direction.\* A limitation of the heirship, within the pale of any particular Protestant community, which may become less and less national as time rolls on, is open to grave objections ; but the limitation of descent within Protestant lines of some kind, appear to rest upon a sound basis. A Roman Catholic Sovereign is involved in complications intolerable to a Protestant people, with a history full of warning against foreign interference. It was a true instinct which led Lord William Russell, amidst the aberrations of party zeal, to deprecate as a terrible calamity the accession of a Papist ; the same instinct prompted the limitation of the Succession Act. Taught by the story of the past, our ancestors guarded against Romish intermeddling, and it is well for the fortunes of this country, that, acting on this maxim, our fathers did not, in a fit of blind generosity, mistaken for justice, open or keep open a door of mischief which, in some perilous hour, it might be impossible to shut.

Another important event was now approaching. James II., tired out by a chequered life, desired to die. He was seized with a fit in early spring, from which he partially recovered ; within the Palace at St. Germains, he was seized, in the midst of his devotions at chapel, with another attack in September. Afterwards he sent for his son, who, seeing the bed stained with blood, burst into violent weeping. Having calmed the child,

\* Stanhope's "Queen Anne," 19.

his father conjured him to adhere to the Catholic faith, to be obedient to his mother, and grateful to the King of France, to serve God with all his strength, and if he should reign, to remember kings were made not for themselves but the good of their people, and to set a pattern of all manner of virtues.\* He exhorted everybody about him to spend pious lives, and urged his few Protestant courtiers and servants to embrace the Catholic faith. It deserves mention that he forgave all who had injured him, mentioning in particular his daughter Anne, and his son-in-law William. But the most important circumstance connected with his dying moments was the visit of the *Grand Monarque*, who promised James he would take his family under his protection, and acknowledge the Prince of Wales as King of England, an assurance which drew joyful tears from the family and courtiers. On Friday, the 16th of September, 1701, James expired; as if a saint had been taken to heaven, the physicians and surgeons who made a *post-mortem* examination, kept particles of his body as reliques, and the attendants dipped their chaplets and handkerchiefs in his blood.† William went into mourning. Coaches and liveries were put in black; but tidings of the promise made by Louis soon aroused indignation. The King was in Holland at this crisis, but Sir Thomas Abney, the Nonconformist Lord Mayor of London, at once caused an address to be voted to His Majesty, expressive of the loyalty of the citizens, and of their determination to oppose France and the Pretender.

After William had returned on his fortunate day,

\* Clarke's "Life of James II.," II. 590-594.

† "Life of James II.," II. 598, 599. "Memoir of Louis XIV.," II. 184.

the 5th of November, he on the 11th dissolved Parliament, and then called another: as he was taking this step, loyal addresses poured in from all parts, and amongst them one from the London Nonconformists, presented by John Howe. They said they were grateful to Divine Providence for the settlement of the Protestant succession, and pledged themselves to use their utmost endeavours to maintain His Majesty's title, and that of his successors, as by law established. An address of the same nature was presented by the Baptists.

A new war now threatened Europe, for Louis had torn in pieces the Ryswick Treaty by the bedside of James, and deliberately defied the provisions of the Act of Settlement; and when William met his new Parliament on the 31st of December, 1701, he told them that the setting up of the pretended Prince of Wales as King of England was not only the highest indignity to himself and the nation, but it concerned every one who valued the Protestant religion or the welfare of his country. "I have shown," these were the closing words he used, "and will always show, how desirous I am to be the common father of all my people. Do you, in like manner, lay aside parties and divisions. Let there be no other distinction heard of amongst us for the future, but of those who are for the Protestant religion and the present Establishment, and of those who mean a Popish Prince and a French Government. I will only add this, if you do in good earnest desire to see England hold the balance of Europe, and to be indeed at the head of the Protestant interest, it will appear by your right improving the present opportunity."\* His speech elicited applause.

\* "Parl. Hist.," V. 1331.

It charmed the Whigs, and many had it ornamentally printed in English, French, and Dutch, and hung up on the walls of their homes. Political animosities were lulled for a while by circumstances inspiring concern for the Empire, and “the whole nation, split before into an hundred adverse factions, with a King at its head evidently declining to his tomb, the whole nation, Lords, Commons, and people, proceeded as one body, informed by one soul.”\* Unanimously it was resolved that no peace should be made with France until after reparation for the indignity done to England.

A mania for oath-taking infected our fathers, and now, in addition to the old law, which had occasioned the nonjuring party, came a new law, which served to revive it. When death had taken away the Sovereign to whom they regarded themselves as pledged while he lived, the Nonjurors began to deliberate about taking the oath, but a new form of abjuration stopped their deliberations.† Ken was troubled at the prospect of its universal imposition, and hoped its enforcement would be limited; but a Bill passed requiring not only all civil officers, but also all ecclesiastics, all members of the Universities, and all schoolmasters to acknowledge William as *lawful and rightful* King, and to deny any title whatever in the pretended Prince of Wales. Sixteen Lords, including Compton, Bishop of London, and Sprat, Bishop of Rochester, protested against the Abjuration Bill;‡ and others reasonably judged that to swear allegiance was one thing, but to swear respecting the nature of a title to the Crown was another, that in the first case people were within the region of fact, that in the second they were brought

\* Edmund Burke.

† Whiston’s “Memoirs,” 32.

‡ “Lords’ Journals,” February 24, 1702.

into the region of theory. The Abjuration Bill received the Royal assent by Commission in the month of March, 1702.

Naturally at this juncture there were Jacobites who felt a flutter of excitement. Looking upon oaths as cobwebs easily brushed away, they hoped the Hanoverian succession might prove an idle dream, and, on the tiptoe of expectation, began eagerly to talk to one another of prospects, which brightened as the declining health of William foreboded his speedy removal. We are apt to read History amidst mental illusions. We unconsciously transfer our knowledge of results to those who were living amidst antecedents. Hence sometimes we credit Englishmen of William's reign with a sense of security which could only arise from a defeat of plots, which then appeared by no means certain. Indeed, the stability of the Revolution Settlement was not assured until the middle of the next century. Up to that time moments occurred when Government knew it sat upon barrels of gunpowder.\* William's throne to the last remained in a shaky condition. The end alone prevents our recognizing the obvious parallel between his reign and that of Louis Philippe in France. A counter-Revolution was imminent throughout; and to our fathers in those days we must not attribute the lordly conviction of permanence which we cherish with so much pride. People in London under William could count on things lasting as they were, with little more confidence than people in Paris could thirty or forty years ago. But powerful elements blended with changes in Great Britain such as have not influenced those of our Gallic neighbours. With them Revolutions

\* See a curious document, dated 1702, January, Macpherson's "Original Papers," I. 602.

have been political, with us religious. Puritanism and Anglo-Catholicism, factors both for good and evil, we find at work on this side the Channel, not on the other.

As Parliament was framing oaths, and Jacobites were brewing plots, Convocation, being restored to activity, plunged itself into new controversies, the outgrowths of old ones, which require to be recorded with some minuteness, in spite of their being as dry as withered thorns.

## CHAPTER VII.

CONVOCATIONAL history in the reign of William III., from the year 1689 to the year 1700, is simply a history of writs and prorogations. During that period no business was ever transacted, the Lower House never met. Tillotson and Tenison, knowing the temper prevalent in the Church, aware of the influence of the nonjuring Clergy, sensible of the wide diffusion of sympathy with them, and alive to the fact of an extensive revival of High-Church principles, were apprehensive of a collision between the two Houses in case they proceeded to business. They therefore thought it prudent to hold in abeyance the right of meeting, until some exigency rendered their coming together indispensable. Indignant murmurs at this state of things freely escaped the lips of many a Dean, Prebendary, Archdeacon, and Rector; and at length found utterance in a publication, which produced a wonderful impression, and led to important results. Few pamphlets have been more famous in their day than the "Letter to a Convocation Man," published in the year 1697. It was widely circulated, read by all sorts of people, canvassed in City coffee-houses, discussed in country inns, talked of by parishioners under church porches, and pondered in rectories, vicarages, and quiet homes all over England. The "Letter" insisted upon

the state of the country, as a reason why the representatives of the Church should assemble in their legal capacity. The constitutional right of Convocation was strongly urged, the Royal writ needful for it being, as the writer alleged, no more a sign of precariousness in this case, than is a Royal writ in any other. A resemblance was traced between Convocation and Parliament, and curious antiquarian and legal questions were reviewed. The author touched on the mode of summoning Convocation, a subject which requires to be explained, not only on account of the use which he made of it, but on account of a use to which it was put by another advocate on the same side.

English Convocations, since the 25th of Henry VIII., came to be convoked exclusively by writs addressed to the Archbishops, who were authorized, under their seals, to summon for business the Clergy of their province. The Archbishop of Canterbury addressed his mandate to the Bishop of London, to be executed by him as his provincial Dean, and the Bishop of each diocese to whom the immediate execution of such a mandate belongs, received directions to make a proper return to his Grace or his Commissary. But, as early as the reign of Edward I., there was introduced into the writ summoning a Bishop to Parliament a clause, called the *præmonentes* or *præmunientes* clause, from its beginning with that word, requiring him to give notice of such writ to the Prior and Chapter, and to the Archdeacon and Clergy, so as to cause the Prior and the Archdeacon, in their own persons, and the Chapter and Clergy by their Procurators, or proxies, one for the Chapter, and two for the Clergy, to be present with him at Westminster, there to attend to public affairs. After the Reformation, Deans were substituted for

Priors ; and, with that alteration, the writ continued to run in its ancient form. The writ indicated exactly the same kind of representatives to be summoned as did the Archbishop's mandate ; and, upon this ground, the author of the "Letter" insisted upon the right of the Lower Clergy to assemble for deliberation as being no less inalienable than the right of the House of Commons—the premonition, or warning, to be delivered to the Clergy being, as he says, "an argument of invincible strength to establish the necessity of Convocations meeting as often as Parliaments." The author of the pamphlet maintained that Convocation had the power of determining its own matters of debate ; but in the maintenance of this position, he had to explain away the sense of the words employed in the writ of summons, *super præmissis, et aliis quæ sibi clarius exponentur ex parte Domini Regis*—words which limit Convocational discussions to topics proposed by Royal authority.\* To this anonymous publication, which roused High Churchmen to activity and filled Low Churchmen with alarm, an answer appeared from the pen of Dr. Wake, already known in the world of letters, through his answers to Bossuet, and other writings on the Roman Catholic controversy, as well as his version of the Epistles of the Apostolical Fathers. He contended that ancient Synods were convened by Royal authority, that when they assembled, the Civil Magistrate had a right to prescribe questions for debate, and that they could not dissolve

\* The letter has been attributed, on the authority of the editor of the "Somers' Tracts" (last edit., XI. 363), to Sir Bartholomew Shower ; on the authority of the editor of Atterbury's "Correspondence" (II. 25, III. 71), to Dr. Binckes, Vicar of Leamington at the time, and in 1703 made Dean of Lichfield. I cannot ascertain the evidence on which either of them proceeds.

without his license. The King of England, he said, had supreme power over English Convocations, and the Clergy could confer on no subject without his permission. After certain historical deductions, he denied that sitting in Convocation is an original Church right, or that it is the same thing as the Parliamentary privilege, vouchsafed by the *præmonentes* clause in writs sent to Bishops. According to Wake's argument, the 25th of Henry VIII. has restored to the Crown its full authority, and placed the control of Convocation entirely in Royal hands; and he ventures to declare the possibility of Church Synods becoming useless and even hurtful; asking, with reference to opinions then violently expressed, "What good can the Prince propose to himself, or any wise man hope for, from any assembly that can be brought together, under the unhappy influence of these and the like prepossessions?" \*

Passing over other combatants, I must particularly notice one who entered the field on the other side, and was destined to play a distinguished part in the political as well as the ecclesiastical affairs of his country. Francis Atterbury, born just before the Act of Uniformity was passed in 1662, and educated first at Westminster and then at Oxford, distinguished himself, at the early age of twenty-five, by the extraordinary ability which he exhibited as a controversialist. He then won literary laurels by answering an attack upon the spirit of Martin Luther and the origin of the Reformation; and soon afterwards, when minister of Bridewell, where his eloquence attracted popular attention, some of his sermons involved him in discussions upon points of moral and practical divinity. He must

\* "The Authority of Christian Princes over their Ecclesiastical Synods," 1697.

have been a fascinating orator, judging from his style of pulpit address, and as an example of elegant composition and tender feeling, which is still better, I would refer to his funeral sermon for Lady Cutts.\* Scarcely had he been made Preacher of the Rolls, when he plunged into a conflict purely classical. Charles Boyle, afterwards Earl of Orrery, who had been Atterbury's pupil at Oxford, published an edition of the Epistles of Phalaris and the Fables of Æsop, then recently eulogized by Sir William Temple. Richard Bentley exposed the spurious character of these Epistles, but in defiance of the exposure which reflected upon the literary reputation of both Temple and Boyle, some of their friends came forward on their behalf ; Swift, in his "Tale of the Tub," and his "Battle of the Books," tilted his lance on the side of his patron Temple, and Atterbury, associated with others under Boyle's name, in an examination of Bentley's Dissertations, appeared as the champion of his late pupil. Though no match for Bentley in scholarship, Atterbury possessed immense power in respect of rhetorical style, clever sophistry, cutting sarcasm, and personal invective ; and these were employed with such effect as for a while to overwhelm the illustrious scholar, and to silence his charges against the defenders of Phalaris. However, the triumph was short ; Bentley resumed his attack, and demolished the work of his critics, in a book which, for learning, logic, and humour, is perhaps unrivalled in that class of productions. Atterbury must have been sorely vexed by his discomfiture when in 1700 he threw himself into the great ecclesiastical contest of the period, and published his "Rights, Powers, and Privileges of an English Convocation." Indulging in

\* Atterbury's "Sermons," I. 232.

his fondness for personal attack, he abused the recent volume by Dr. Wake as a shallow and empty performance, deficient in historical learning and destructive of Church liberty. After referring to the ancient practice of holding provincial Synods, he treated Convocations as coming in their room, and as constituting necessary appendages to English Parliaments. He insisted much upon the fact of the Clergy having been summoned by the *præmunicentes* clause in the writs addressed to spiritual Peers, and regretted that by a political blunder the legislative representation of the Church had become separated from the legislative representation of the State. Without, however, attempting to revive obsolete proceedings, he asserted most pertinaciously the indefeasible right of the clerical order to sit in Convocation, and to petition, advise, address, represent, and declare their judgment upon their own affairs, notwithstanding their inability to make, or attempt, any new canons without express Royal authority.

The question of assembling Convocation started from an historical point of view, but it came before the public mind in its constitutional and practical bearings; yet, amidst the multitude of publications on the subject, one seeks in vain for a consistent and satisfying treatment of the subject on either side. Those who believed in Convocation, and who wished to see it vigorously revived, did not dare to express all that they believed, or all that they wished; they were checked by the spirit of the age, and hampered by the circumstances of the Church. At the same time they ignored the great change which had come over political and ecclesiastical affairs through the Revolution, and they also shut their eyes to the fact, that it is impossible to enjoy State patronage and emoluments without some abridg-

ment of ecclesiastical action. Those who wished Convocation should not assemble feared to deny its rights, and shrank from either proposing its extinction or advocating its reform. They only desired to mesmerize it, till clerical animosities should expire, and the Church should be of one mind, a consummation no nearer now than it was then. The prudence forced upon this class of persons by their political position, asserted itself at the expense of logical consistency ; and, as is often the case, practical sagacity made men awkward reasoners. Nor was there conclusiveness of historical argument, or any consistency of demand, on the other side. High-Church advocates were puzzled how to forge links of union between English Convocations and the early Synods of the Church, especially the assembly at Jerusalem. The essential conditions of a Convocation of Canterbury are that it must meet by authority from the Crown ; that it consist of two Houses, one composed of Bishops, and the other of Presbyters, both purely clerical ; that the members of the Lower House must be dignitaries, together with Proctors, elected by the Clergy, and that nothing which they do has binding force without the consent of the Sovereign. What precedent for any of the essential parts of the structure can be found in the history of the meeting at Jerusalem ? Nor can any specific likeness be traced between mixed Anglo-Saxon Councils and purely clerical Convocations. An Anglo-Saxon provincial Synod was in many points very unlike Convocation ; and between A.D. 816, when the Synod of Challock occurred, in which Abbots, Presbyters, and Deacons met, and A.D. 1065, I do not find that more than one provincial Synod was held ; a national Synod met under Dunstan, A.D. 969. Provincial Synods, previously occasional and rare, be-

came frequent and regular in and after the reign of Edward I.

Convocation, with full power to deliberate, to propose and enact canons, to alter existing formularies, to pronounce authoritatively upon points of doctrine, and to originate schemes of ecclesiastical action, co-ordinate with the functions of Parliament, would have been a reality ; but Convocation, as it was permitted to exist under William III., was only a mere form, and that a very troublesome one. Atterbury, and those who sided with him, did not endeavour to bring it into accordance with their theory. The theory claimed ecclesiastical independence ; but when they saw the difficulties of their position, they only endeavoured to loosen a little the chain which bound up their liberty of action. The new Ministry, formed in 1700, stipulated that Convocation should be restored to its sessional rights and privileges. This point being conceded, those of the Clergy whom it particularly gratified, burst into a state of clamorous excitement, broaching new or reviving old theories. Atterbury, as earnest in action as he was eloquent in speech, regarded it as eminently a critical juncture, and felt a strong desire that those members who thought with him should come to town a fortnight beforehand for consultation. He wished them, he said, to take proper methods for preventing or breaking through the snares of enemies.\* He urged upon his friends, Trelawny, Sprat, and Compton, the execution of the *præmunientes* clause in the Parliamentary writ, as well as the execution of the Archbishop's provincial mandate.† In this measure the Bishops just named concurred, and used

\* Atterbury's "Correspondence," III. 10.

† Ibid., 11, 13, 17.

their writs accordingly ; so did Hough, Bishop of Lichfield, and Mew, Bishop of Winchester.

Tenison, in his archiepiscopal barge, started from Lambeth Palace on Monday morning, February the 10th, and landed at St. Paul's Wharf, whence he was escorted by a number of Advocates and Proctors to the west end of the new Cathedral ; the Portland stone being then unblackened by London smoke, and the structure, as well as its ornaments, being still in a state of incompleteness. Received by the Dean and Canons, his Grace was conducted to the choir, and placed in the Dean's Stall, fresh from the touch of the carver's chisel, the Suffragan Bishops occupying the other stalls on either side. After the Litany had been chanted in Latin, the Bishop of Chichester preached, and at the close of the sermon the choir sung an anthem. The assembly proceeded to the new Chapter-House, where the Archbishop addressed his brethren, after the writ of summons had been read by the Bishop of London. The election of a Prolocutor for the Lower House followed in order ; the Dean of Canterbury, Dr. George Hooper, being preferred to the Dean of Gloucester, Dr. William Jane. High Churchmen, with dismal forebodings of opposition from Low Churchmen, whispered amongst themselves as soon as they had presented their Prolocutor, that perhaps they would be adjourned, without permission to enter on business. This policy Atterbury determined to obstruct ; for, said he, if we come to any resolutions, they will certainly be for the honour and interest of the Church, since we have a majority in the Lower House, as remarkable as that of our opponents in the Upper.\*

\* Atterbury's "Correspondence," III. 22.

Convocation having solemnly assembled, and the usual preliminaries being accomplished, Atterbury was intent on going to work ; but his correspondence indicates that he moved too fast to please some of his brethren, and that he had reason to apprehend they meant to reject his leadership. They had not proceeded many steps, when Dr. Ashurst and Dr. Freeman incurred Atterbury's censure, because after the Archbishop's form of prorogation had come down, and the Prolocutor had informed the House they were not to regard themselves as being prorogued until he told them they were, these two gentlemen, as the Archdeacon states, were very noisy, insisting upon it that they were actually prorogued, and that it was a dangerous thing for them, under such circumstances, to sit any longer. The Prolocutor immediately arose, and said, as these gentlemen were fidgeting about in their scarlet robes, that if they thought they were incurring any risk, they were at liberty to depart. They immediately rose, with the hope of a respectable following, but as they vanished, they were, if we may depend on an opponent's report, followed only by a general smile, and the condemnation of their own party.\* Another question agitated the House the same day. Complaints were made of episcopal interference with the election of clergymen, and accordingly a resolution to that effect passed the House, supported by a large number, says one authority, by a small number, says another.† The same day a committee was appointed to investigate disputed elections, a step which, in the estimation of Low Churchmen, encroached

\* Atterbury's "Correspondence," III. 31.

† "Letter to a Clergyman in the Country," p. 1. "Answer to the Letter," p. 4.

upon the episcopal prerogative, for they maintained that the Bishop with his suffragans must be the final judge of all such matters.\*

Robing themselves on the 28th of February, the members glided along the aisles of the Abbey up the steps to Henry the VII.'s Chapel, when they proceeded to business, without taking any notice of their right reverend superiors, who had also robed themselves that same morning, and sat down within the Jerusalem Chamber. It plainly appeared that the two ecclesiastical conclaves were becoming hostile camps. A message from the Archbishop soon reached the Lower House, asking for an explanation, why they went to prayers before the Bishops came. The question at issue now formally arose, and then began a lengthened contest, as to whether the Lower House had self-contained rights, like those of the Commons, a right of self-adjournment and prorogation, and a right to meet, consult, and resolve, without being dependent from step to step upon the will of Prelates. The High-Church party, so zealous in theory for episcopal order, thus in practice broke with their right reverend fathers. In the controversy was mixed up also an obstinate contention on the part of the Prolocutor about what was meant by the words, *in hunc locum* in the Archbishop's schedule; to settle this point were added the words, "*vulgo vocatum* Jerusalem Chamber." For a little while, some semblance of union continued. Each party treated the other with punctilious respect. Atterbury, indeed, at the commencement anticipated, in the matter of the address, a "tough dispute," and, as he said this, resembled a war-horse snorting on the edge of a battle-field. He pressed the Lower House not to wait

\* "The New Danger of Presbytery," 3.

for the Lords, but to prepare an address of its own ; yet, when an address came down to them, the Lower House heartily joined in it, only proposing a slight alteration, which the Prelates approved. Ripples quickly rose on the surface of debate ; two days afterwards, however, we find both Houses amicably taking a journey to the pleasant village of Kensington, where stood His Majesty's favourite palace. On Monday afternoon, March the 10th, the Archbishop and Bishops, in their distinctive attire, and the Prolocutor in his cap and hood, and the rest of the Clergy following, took coach at the west end of the Abbey, and proceeded by Knightsbridge and the side of the Park—the trees beginning to bud with early spring, the people by the way watching the dignitaries as their faces peered through the windows of the lumbering vehicles—until, arriving at the Dutch-looking palace, with its prim gardens, the procession of the Clergy reached the Royal presence. A loyal address was presented, and a gracious reply returned.

The tug of war, of which there had been omens before that pleasant excursion, began in earnest soon afterwards. The Lower House asserted its claim to independent action, to adjourn itself when and where it pleased, to originate and transact business howsoever it pleased ; always, it should be distinctly stated, choosing its time of sitting according to the time fixed by his Grace of Canterbury's schedule. A matter of business, originating in the Lower House, without consultation with the Upper, and in known opposition to its wishes, was the examination of Toland's "Christianity not Mysterious ;" at the same time another book, entitled, "Essays on the Balance of Power,"—in which the author asserted, that men had

been promoted in the Church who were remarkable for nothing but their disbelief in the Divinity of Christ,—attracted the attention of the Upper House; upon which their Lordships caused to be affixed to the Abbey doors a paper calling upon the author, whoever he might be, to make good his assertions or to submit to punishment.

When Toland's book was sent up from the Lower House to the Bishops for judgment, they felt that it was a serious matter to enter upon the business, as by condemning certain published opinions, and approving others, they might be altering the recognized doctrines of the Church, and that to censure the books without license from the King would incur certain penalties.

Upon the eve of a prorogation for Easter, after the dispute about the rights of sitting and adjournment had been carried on with an obstinacy which it would be tiresome to describe, the Archbishop delivered to the members of Convocation a speech, in which he alluded to the existing dispute;\* but in spite of a prorogation till the 8th of May, the Prolocutor and some of the Clergy persevered in their assertion of independence, and continued to sit for some hours. This policy, esteemed by some High Churchmen as an unconstitutional stretch of power, led to a secession, which weakened the party.

When all had come back from celebrating Easter, and the Prolocutor appeared before the Upper House with a paper in his hand, the Primate returned to the old charge of irregularity. The Prolocutor replied, that he had been commanded by the Lower House to bring up a paper, which was found to contain arguments against the course pursued in reference to

\* Lathbury's "History of Convocation," 351.

Toland's work. The Bishops recommended there should be a committee of the two Houses, with a view to an amicable arrangement, but the majority of the Lower House, refusing to nominate any committee for the purpose, determined to ride the high horse, and to dig the spur deep into its flanks; so when the schedule of adjournment came down, the Prolocutor refused to notice it at all, and adjourned on his own authority,—an act against which Beveridge, Sherlock, and others protested. What still more annoyed the Upper House, was that the Clergy, under the Prolocutor's presidency, agreed upon a censure of Burnet's “*Exposition of the XXXIX Articles*.” Anything but unanimity and decorum marked the proceedings of the Lower Assembly at this moment; and words uttered within the Abbey walls were reported outside in garbled forms, which led to explanations and counter-explanations, to assertions and denials. Connected with the presentation of the censure upon Burnet's book to the Upper House, there occurred two or three curious episodes. Adjoining the Jerusalem Chamber is a small apartment called the Organ Chamber; and there, a month before, on the 5th of April, had happened an incident which ruffled the feelings of the very reverend Prolocutor, and the clergymen who accompanied him. They were kept waiting at their Lordships' door, as they said, an hour and a half; as their opponents said, only so long as was needful to read their paper and debate upon it: the circumstance being attributed by some to the insolence of the Prelates, by others to a mistake of the doorkeeper. On the 30th of May, when the Prolocutor, with the Deans of Windsor and Christ Church, went up with the paper about Burnet's book, and were waiting a while in the

antechamber, the Bishop of Bangor came out, commissioned by their Lordships, to ask the Prolocutor whether the message he had now to bring would set right the alleged irregularity. The Prolocutor, after evading that question, on entering the Bishops' Chamber, stated, that he had brought a humble representation touching an "Exposition of the XXXIX Articles," that it had no relation to the alleged irregularity; yet with regard to that, they were ready to satisfy their Lordships whenever called upon to do so. The paper containing the censure was rejected. The Bishop of Bangor complained of prevarication, and the charge at once fanned the Lower House into a fresh blaze of resentment. At this time, as on a former occasion, some of the minority in the Lower House protested against the proceedings of the majority, and the protest, in its turn, became another element of discord.

Upon the 6th of June, as the Prolocutor and his friends crowded the little Organ Chamber, whom should they find there, quietly putting on his robes, but the Welsh Bishop, whom they so much disliked. Looking at him, the incensed president of the Lower House asked, according to one version, "Were you pleased to say in the Upper House that I lied to you?" According to a second, "My Lord of Bangor, did you say I lied?" The Bishop answered, "I did not say you lied; but I did say, or might say, that you told me a very great untruth." Amidst threats and demands of satisfaction, the Prelate was glad to get into a more serene atmosphere; where, however, as soon as the Prolocutor had been admitted, arose a renewal of personal strife. The Prolocutor having inquired whether their Lordships had entered upon their Acts any reflections on his conduct, Tenison

rejoined, “Acts, we have no acts, only minutes.” Burnet, with characteristic impetuosity, his round face no doubt flushed with scarlet—cried aloud, “This is fine, indeed. The Lower House will not allow a committee to inspect their books, and now they demand to see ours.” “I ask nothing,” exclaimed the Prolocutor, “but what I am concerned to know, and what of right I may demand.” “This,” retorted Burnet, “is according to your usual insolence.” “Insolence, my Lord, do you give me that word?” asked the other. “Yes, insolence,” reiterated the Bishop of Salisbury; “you deserve that word, and worse. Think what you will of yourself, I know what you are.” The Archbishop civilly interposed, that perhaps the Prolocutor had been misrepresented, which the Prolocutor turned to his own advantage, with the remark, that he was “satisfied if in this matter he stood right in their Lordships’ opinion; about what his Lordship of Salisbury pleased to think, he felt not much concerned.” Back went the Dean to Henry the VII.’s Chapel, determined to make the best of the business; but when he said that the Upper House had expressed their satisfaction, the correctness of his statements was called in question.\* Another heap of fuel was thus cast upon the blazing fire, and it was moved and carried that the House should resent the indignity offered to their Prolocutor.

The Upper House, on the 13th of June, determined

\* In drawing up this account I have used, besides Kennet’s, Burnet’s, and Lathbury’s Histories, the “Memoirs of Tenison,” “Narrative of the Proceedings of the Lower House, etc.,” “A Letter to the Author of the Narrative, etc.,” and “The History of the Convocation, drawn up from the Journal of the Upper House, etc.” “The Narrative” gives the High Church view; “The History” the Lower. It is ascribed to Kennet.

that the Lower had no power judicially to censure any book ; that it ought not to have entered upon the examination of one by a Bishop, without acquainting the Bishops with it ; that the censure on the Bishop of Sarum's work was in general terms, without any citation of passages ; that the Bishop had done great service by his "History of the Reformation," and other writings ; and that, though private persons might expound the Articles, it was not proper for Convocation to enter upon such a subject. They also resolved, that the Bishop of Bangor had made a true and just report of what had taken place between himself and the Prolocutor ; that the paper read by the latter did not relate to the irregularity complained of ; and that his answer was such as ought not to have been given to his Grace, or to any member of the Upper House. Convocation was prorogued to the 7th of August, then to the 18th of September, and was at length dissolved with the Parliament. All the Prelates, with three exceptions, concurred in these proceedings. The exceptions were Compton, Bishop of London ; Trelawny, Bishop of Exeter ; and Sprat, who, with the Deanery of Westminster, held the Bishopric of Rochester.

Compton, after his extreme liberalism and low churchmanship at the time of the Revolution, had by the end of the century become a Tory ; and now he threw his influence into the High-Church scale, without, however, making himself conspicuous in the Convocation controversy. Trelawny, one of the seven Bishops who had been immensely popular in his native county at the time of the great trial, retained a secret attachment to James II. after the Revolution. That monarch had, in the midst of his troubles, promised to translate him from Bristol to Exeter ; but the turn of

events in favour of William, so it is insinuated, drew the Bishop into a betrayal of his old master; at any rate, in some way, from William he obtained his improved preferment, but afterwards he showed himself anxious to deny that the Bishops had invited the Prince over, though, as he said, “we found ourselves obliged to accept of the deliverance.”\* Trelawny never showed any sympathy with the party led by Tillotson, Burnet, and Tenison; and, in the “Correspondence” of Atterbury, he appears as the chief of those to whom as diocesan and friend, the lively and interesting letters of the Archdeacon of Totnes are addressed. The Archdeacon constantly kept the Bishop informed of what was going on in the Jerusalem Chamber and in Henry the VII.’s Chapel; and it is plain, from the way in which he wrote, how much influence he had acquired over his patron’s mind. The intimate, cordial, and approving friend of Atterbury could not but be opposed to the proceedings of Tenison and Burnet. Sprat was not a man of much principle; he had joined with Dryden and Waller in poetic praise of Oliver Cromwell, he had sat on James’ High Commission, he had read the “Declaration of Indulgence” in servile submissiveness, but with faltering lips; he had voted for the Regency, and then taken the new oaths, and assisted at the Coronation; and though he had cleared himself from the charge of treason, there is reason to believe that he was Jacobite at heart. He hated Nonconformists, and went in for High Church measures; and as no love was lost between the Bishops of Rochester and Salisbury, the latter said of the former, he had “been deeply engaged in the

\* See Letters described in “First Report of Hist. MSS. Com.,” 52. What Trelawny says I have noticed before.

former reigns, and he stuck firm to the party to which, by reason of the liberties of his life, he brought no sort of honour.” \*

In the spring of 1701, when the great ecclesiastical tournament was going on within the Abbey walls, a new ecclesiastical knight entered the lists outside, in the field of literature. He not only broke a lance, but engaged in a hand-to-hand encounter with the famous antagonist who had distinguished himself equally in book-writing and in debate; White Kennet came forward to answer Francis Atterbury. White Kennet—a curious-looking person, whose forehead, to the day of his death, bore witness to an accident which happened in his youth, for he wore a large patch of black velvet over a ghastly scar—was a man of great archeological research, an eminent Saxon scholar, and a friend of Mr. Tanner and of Dr. Hickes. He had published, in 1695, his well-known “Parochial Antiquities,” and now he sent forth his “Ecclesiastical Synods and Parliamentary Convocations historically stated and vindicated from the Misrepresentations of Mr. Atterbury.” Kennet’s main positions are, that Parliamentary Convocations are not in essence and nature the same things as ecclesiastical synods; that not spiritual affairs, but the taxing of the Clergy, gave the first occasion of their being called together in connection with Parliament, their first appearance in that association being in the year 1282, in the eleventh year of Edward I., the first proctors of the rural priesthood being soon brought into parliamentary attendance. Repeatedly he asserts that Parliamentary Convocations, although ecclesiastical in their constituent parts, are not ecclesiastical in their objects and

\* “Own Time,” II. 285.

purposes, and he repeatedly charges Atterbury with confusing civil councils with sacred synods.\*

It was a pet idea with Atterbury, that Bishops should avail themselves of the *præmunientes* clause. Kennet undertook to show that he was mistaken as to the time of its origin ; that he incorrectly maintained the constancy of its practical application ; that he was deceived in his notion of its nature and effect, and that the modern had not, any more than the ancient Clergy, reason to be fond of it. The provincial summons to Convocation issued by an Archbishop, he maintained to be a sufficient authority without diocesan writs. Of the erudition and ingenuity shown in his book there can be no doubt, but I am at a loss to understand what bearing his arguments, as far as they go, for it must be remembered he gives only the first part of the work, are meant to have on the practical determination of the controversy. If, as he represented, the existing Convocation was but the relic of an extinguished prerogative of self-taxation once possessed by the Clergy, then it remained only the shadow of a name, and stood amongst the meaningless things which it would be a good clearance to sweep away. If he took such a view, he does not, so far as I can find, express it ; rather he assumes throughout, that Convocations by Royal authority, under archiepiscopal control, without the power of making laws or discussing theological or ecclesiastical questions, are quite wise and proper. How they can be so when reduced to such a nullity, it is difficult to conceive.

When winter approached, the prospect of a new Parliament and a new Convocation opened on the eyes of Atterbury with a fascinating effect ; and as the

\* See "Ecclesiastical Synods," 99-149, 245.

autumn leaves fell in the London parks, the Archdeacon girded up his loins for a fresh attack. He was concerned about many things, about the opposition his party was likely to encounter, about the exact place for holding Convocation, and about the execution of the *præmonitentes* clause, notwithstanding Kennet's destructive criticisms.\* At the same time it was thought the Lower House needed more room for their assembly. Sir Christopher Wren was consulted on the subject; but "any carpenter in the town understood that matter as well as he, and I would undertake," said the impatient Archdeacon, "to bring one that should contrive seats to hold near six score, which is more than ever yet met at once."†

Christmas festivities had scarcely ended, holly branches still hung in the parish churches, when the new Convocation met. The day before New Year's Day, after a Latin service read by the Bishop of Oxford, a Latin sermon preached by the Dean of St. Paul's, and the King's writ with the Bishop of London's certificate formally delivered, the Clergy retired to choose a Prolocutor. No sooner had they met, than the embers of strife were kindled afresh. The first contention pertained to proxy votes, the Dean of Canterbury contending they were valid, others answering they were quite contrary to custom. The election of Prolocutor was the next struggle. Even such a candidate as Beveridge, decided Anglican as he was, could not satisfy the extreme party, and they elected the Dean of Salisbury, Dr. Woodward, a civilian who had grown popular with High Churchmen by opposing his Diocesan, with whom at that very moment he was

\* Atterbury's "Correspondence," III. 53.

† Ibid., 57.

engaged in litigation. The election over, the new Prolocutor approached the chair occupied by the Dean of St. Paul's as temporary president whilst the votes were being taken ; but the Dean kept possession of his seat, on the ground that the Prolocutor could not preside, as really there was no House ; and when the Prolocutor was presented to the Archbishop, he made a speech bristling with military allusions.

After this, Archbishop Tenison recommended charity and union, and lamented existing divisions, the only good effect of which, he said, was the impulse it had given to the study of historical questions as to Convocational rights. Now reappeared the old bone of contention. The Prolocutor would not admit the power of the Upper House to prorogue the Lower. "Mr. Prolocutor," said Archdeacon Beveridge, "I advise you, in the name of Jesus Christ, not to open our first meeting in such contempt and disobedience to the Archbishop and Bishops, and in giving such offence and scandal to our enemies." "I have," replied Woodward, "the power to alter the schedule when I intimate it."\* The battle for independence now reopened.

The Clergy, on the 20th of January, assembled early in the cold nave of the Abbey, after which they proceeded to prayers in the Jerusalem Chamber. Thence they returned to Henry the VII.'s Chapel, where they found the floor matted and curtains hung,—no small comfort on a frosty morning.† If their feet were as warm as their tempers, they had no reason to complain, for no sooner had they taken their places than it was proposed to have prayers by themselves, to show their independence. The motion was opposed, but the

\* Lathbury's "History of Convocation," 363-365.

† "Gibson Papers," VI. 8.

question as to adjournment was renewed.\* Afterwards came discussions about committees for purposes presented in the last Convocation, when further personalities arose. On the 28th, Atterbury proposed, and at last carried the point, that the Prolocutor should have inserted in the minutes a phrase which assumed the right of independent assembling. Another source of discord was found in the quarrel between Burnet and Woodward the Prolocutor. Some members complained of a breach of privilege, and an indignity to Convocation offered to the Prolocutor by Burnet, his Diocesan, who was said to have required him to attend a visitation, while he was occupied with Convocational duties, and to have issued a process against him for non-compliance. On the 9th of February, Beveridge "made a long and pathetic speech." "He earnestly exhorted both sides to union, and to think of such methods of healing the breach as might secure the Lower House's liberty, and yet not entrench on the Archbishop's authority." He so influenced his brethren, that a committee was appointed to consider an expedient for composing differences;† but to this note of peace there speedily succeeded another outburst of war.

Never, perhaps, did Convocation pass through a more tumultuous day than Thursday, the 12th of February, ushered in though it was by a circumstance adapted to calm the spirit of an excited assembly. Between 9 and 10 o'clock,—as the members of the Lower House were pacing up and down the nave of Westminster Abbey, not then crowded with monuments as it is now, waiting for the commencement of

\* Details are given in "Lambeth MSS., Gibson," VI. 9, 10.

† "Faithful account of some transactions in the three last sessions of the present Convocation." Attributed to Atterbury.

business, and eager to know what turn discussions were about to take,—news came that Woodward, the Prolocutor, had been taken ill, and had sent as a deputy, Aldrich, Dean of Christ Church, a man of like spirit with himself. Upon proceeding to read prayers, the deputy was interrupted by a question, whether he ought to take the chair, without receiving the sanction of the Archbishop. Kennet and Birch hastily departed to inform his Grace of what had been done; but on their way through the cloisters\* to the yard, into which opened the principal door leading to the Jerusalem Chamber, they were stopped by a member, who proposed that they should return and wait until after prayers. As Aldrich, encouraged by Atterbury, ventured to take the chair, “a tumultuous noise,” arose, and certain members “persisted with vehemence in their demand, that the Dean of Christ Church should relinquish the chair.”† After this disturbance they received an order to attend their Lordships of the Upper House. Accordingly they left Henry the VII.’s Chapel, the Dean of Christ Church at their head “in his square cap and a verger before him,” and crowded up the steps to the Jerusalem Chamber, where, they heard from the lips of the Archbishop a simple acknowledgment of a paper of consequence having been received, in allusion to their choice of a deputy, as “an incident of great moment;” together with a formal announcement of prorogation until February the 14th. In accordance with a boisterous suggestion, about forty-two members rushed towards the steps of Henry the VII.’s Chapel, and there in defiance of archiepiscopal authority, placed their sub-Prolocutor in the

\* “Lambeth MSS., Gibson,” VI. 18.

† “Faithful account, etc.”

chair ; then having saved their rights, they formally adjourned to the day fixed by the Upper House. Woodward died on the 13th of February, and the House, now destitute of a Prolocutor, became incapable of constitutional action. The first object of desire with the members struggling for independence, was to supply the deficiency ; but this was what the Archbishop and his friends in the Upper House determined to prevent. When, therefore, the Lower House, on the 14th, formally communicated intelligence of the death of Dr. Woodward, his Grace curtly expressed surprise at the news, and at once ordered a schedule of prorogation for the day after Ash-Wednesday. On their assembling he told his brethren, on the one hand, that they were mistaken who thought that he and the Bishops wished to bring Convocation to an end ; and, on the other, that such heats as theirs were a scandal to the Church. The party who sympathized with the Bishops felt satisfied ; a majority felt otherwise. They met of their own accord in Henry the VII.'s Chapel, and having chosen a Chairman or Moderator, marched up to the old anteroom, which had become a sort of outpost for the episcopal garrison, where invincible besiegers were ever pressing upon the trenches of the citadel. A new point of difference arose. As amidst the confusion of the crowded apartments, some members began to dictate a message to the effect that the House wished to proceed to an election, Kennet interposed, saying he hoped the message would not be worded so, for they were not a House, and some of the members, he being one, did not agree to the proposed message. The Bishop wrote down the communication as coming from certain members of the Lower House, a form of expression

vehemently opposed by several of the listening and agitated group.

One death had already disabled the Lower House, another death suddenly and completely extinguished its paralyzed and convulsed existence. William of Orange fell from his horse as he was riding in the neighbourhood of Hampton Court, and broke his collar-bone. Removed to Kensington, he was seized with shivering fits, and it soon appeared death was approaching. The Earl of Portland states, “that when he was once encouraging him, from the good state his affairs were in both at home and abroad, to take more heart, the King answered him, that he knew death was that which he had looked at on all occasions without any terror ; sometimes he would have been glad to have been delivered out of all his troubles, but he confessed now he saw another scene, and could wish to live a little longer. He died with a clear and full presence of mind, and in a wonderful tranquillity. Those who knew it was his rule all his life long to hide the impressions that religion made on him, as much as possible, did not wonder at his silence in his last minutes ; but they lamented it much, they knew what a handle it would give to censure and obloquy.” \* Early on Sunday, January the 8th, he received “the Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, with great devotion, from the hands of the Archbishop of Canterbury,” † about 8 o’clock he was a corpse. Round his neck a black ribbon was discovered with a gold ring, and a lock of Queen Mary’s hair.

The moral conduct of the King had not been in accordance with his religious professions. Burnet, who honestly gives his impressions of William’s character,

\* Burnet, II. 303.      † “Hist. of King William III.,” 513.

says in a few words, “He had no vice but of one sort, in which he was very cautious and secret,” a statement which, whilst it presents a contrast to James and Charles, who were barefaced in their sensualities, admits the fact of William’s being addicted to vicious indulgence, of which concealment neither expiated nor diminished the guilt. It is not a little surprising that so many good men, both Churchmen and Dissenters, who could not have been indifferent to the interests of morality, should have lauded, as they did, the Hero of the Revolution, both living and dead, as if he had been the very ideal of virtue and piety. Yet Burnet, who was disposed to take the most favourable view of his character, cannot be charged with exaggeration when he informs us, that “he believed the truth of the Christian religion very firmly, and he expressed a horror at atheism and blasphemy, and though there was much of both in his Court, yet it was always denied to him, and kept out of his sight. He was most exemplary, decent, and devout in the public exercises of the worship of God, only on week days he came too seldom to them. He was an attentive hearer of sermons, and was constant in his private prayers and in reading the Scriptures; and when he spoke of religious matters, which he did not often, it was with a becoming gravity. He was much possessed with the belief of absolute decrees: he said to me, he adhered to these, because he did not see how the belief of Providence could be maintained upon any other supposition. His indifference as to the forms of Church government and his being zealous for toleration, together with his cold behaviour towards the Clergy, gave them generally very ill impressions of him.”\*

\* “Own Time,” II. 305.

The effect of frigid manners, felt by the nation at large, was deepened in the case of High Churchmen, by William's well-known Presbyterian predilections, and his dislike to what is meant by Anglo-Catholicism. As we have seen, during the life of Mary, he left the exercise of his prerogative in reference to ecclesiastical matters in her hands, and after her death meddled with them in the smallest possible degree; hence he never could be said to have exerted any direct influence in the government of his Church. But, indirectly, by the Revolution itself, and by the Act of Toleration which followed and was promoted by him, he changed the position of the Establishment altogether, and opened up to the Episcopal Church a new career, in which conciliation instead of persecution could alone prove its permanent safeguard, and a secret of prosperity. The first monarch on the throne of these realms who loved a constitutional system of religious liberty, William not only won the affection of Dissenters, as he might be naturally expected to do, but by his wise and equitable policy in this respect, laid the whole kingdom and posterity under obligations which have never yet been fully acknowledged.

## CHAPTER VIII.

THE most distinguished divines who sat upon the Episcopal Bench in the reign of William III., were more or less imbued with what were called Latitudinarian sentiments.

Tillotson and Tenison—who did so much, especially the latter of them, by force of character, as well as prominence of position, towards keeping the Church in subordination to the State—have already occupied a considerable space in this History. Next to them, Burnet was most distinguished, and he also has received repeated notice as an ecclesiastical statesman ; it should be added, that he was no less a diligent diocesan and a laborious divine. His treatise on “*Pastoral Care*” expresses the spiritual anxieties of a good minister of Jesus Christ : his Histories are pervaded by a spirit of Erastianism, as described by some, by a tone of liberality, as denoted by others ; and his “*Exposition of the XXXIX Articles*,” in like manner, is both condemned as latitudinarian, and commended as comprehensive. No work gives me so favourable an opinion of Burnet as his “*Four Discourses*,” delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Sarum.\* For learning, earnestness, and ability, they deserve a higher place in theological literature than they have ever won. In

\* “The Bishop of Sarum’s Four Treatises” appeared in 1695.

them he exhibits the evidences of the Christian religion, with considerable vigour of thought, and for the age in which he wrote, with much originality. His dissertation on the Divinity and death of Christ exhibits the orthodox Creed, as to the Godhead and Atonement of the Lord, together with a view of Justification by Faith, very similar to that inculcated in the writings of Bull. The authority of the Church he discusses as an enlightened Protestant, and demolishes the arguments of the Papists; giving, as he proceeds, some valuable hints on the history of religious opinions, and dealing with the dogma of infallibility in a way which is singularly curious, looked at in the light of the recent Ecumenical Council. The obligation to continue in the communion of the Church of England is exhibited, from his own point of view, in a temperate spirit.

Stillingfleet accepted, in reward for his theological services, the See of Worcester, in 1689. His reputation, connected with a friendly bearing towards Dissenters in the latter, as in the earlier period of his life, caused him to be engaged as referee in a doctrinal dispute, to be hereafter related; his polemical skill and unimpeachable orthodoxy were manifested afresh in his "Vindication of the Trinity;" he also entered into a metaphysical controversy with Locke, but to diocesan duties Stillingfleet devoted the remainder of his life. In his younger days he had been an eloquent preacher, generally dwelling upon the ethical more than the doctrinal side of religion; he nevertheless insisted upon theological points, following, in his views of salvation, Bull's line of thought, as did Burnet, and others of the same school. There is an hortatory tone in his sermons, approaching in fervour to that of the Puritans, which, if not in harmony with the taste of

the upper classes in the palmy days of Tillotson's popularity, must have commended Stillingfleet's ministry to the hearts of common people.

Patrick, made Bishop of Chichester in 1689, and of Ely in 1691, was a man of inferior ability to Stillingfleet, but of greater learning, perhaps of higher spiritual mark. Ranked amongst Latitudinarians through his early connection with John Smith and Henry More, he caught and infused into some of his writings a Platonic tincture ; but as to the philosophical spirit of inquiry, cultivated in the Cambridge school, he was a perfect alien. He agreed, with the least moderate of the class, in a dislike to Puritanism, and went beyond them all in dogmatic emphasis and Anglican leanings. He distinguished between traditions to be rejected and traditions to be received, including amongst the latter not only primitive testimony as to the transmission of Scripture, and the settlement of the Canon, but as to the doctrines of the Faith, and the polity of the Church. He insisted upon the efficacy of baptism as producing regeneration, and held that ordinance to be necessary for the salvation of infants. As to the Lord's Supper, he dwelt little upon its nature, but much upon its benefits, and the duty of frequent communion.\* He wrote a number of practical and devout books ; amongst them the "Parable of the Pilgrim," which might be read with more satisfaction, did it not provoke humiliating comparisons with Bunyan's Allegory. The reputation Patrick enjoyed in his own day for devout composition, suffers greatly when, in the light of modern taste and criticism, we examine the forms which he prepared for the revised Prayer Book, con-

\* Burnet, Evelyn and Dunton bear witness to Patrick's preaching power.

templated in 1680 ; but I know of nothing to invalidate the manner in which his conduct as a Bishop is eulogized. He early appeared as a champion of the Church of England against Dissent, by publishing what he called a “Friendly Debate,” in point of fact, a most unfriendly production, full of virulent attacks upon those who separated from the established communion, and even advocating coercion in the service of Uniformity.\* It may be hoped Patrick repented of the spirit betrayed by that publication, for he expressed in the House of Lords “regret for the warmth with which he had written against the Dissenters in his younger years;” and Wharton said of him, “After he was made a Bishop, he lost his reputation through imprudent management, openly favouring the Dissenters, and employing none but such, whereupon he lost the love of the gentry.”† After the Revolution, he expressed concern at finding so little of unity and concord, when it was natural to expect they would have been the result of that deliverance. He seems to have become weary of the world before he left it, and cried out with the Psalmist, “O that I had wings like a dove ! for then would I fly away and be at rest.”

To the class of Cambridge theologians probably belongs John Moore, consecrated Bishop of Norwich in 1691, who is described as enjoying Burnet’s confidence, and as being consulted by him in the composition of his works. But Moore was one of a considerable number who gain a reputation among friends for ability to do what they never accomplish ; since, according to one of his eulogists, “the world had reason to expect from him many excellent and useful works,” had not

\* Patrick’s “Works,” VI. 156.

† “Lansdowne MSS., Kennet Coll.,” 987, 294.

episcopal duties prevented their being composed. He was also one of a still greater number in whom the love of books weakens regard for the rights of property ; for according to a critic less friendly to his reputation, Moore indulged an “avarice in that respect,” which “carried him a step beyond the sin of coveting.” His library numbered 30,000 volumes, and was bought, after his death, by George I., as a present to the University of Cambridge.

Cumberland, made Bishop of Peterborough in 1691, wrote in reply to Hobbes, a Latin treatise, “On the Laws of Nature,” mentioned in a former volume, and of him his great grandson Richard says, “He had no pretension to quick and brilliant talents ; but his mind was fitted for elaborate and profound researches, as his works more fully testify.” He is known to posterity, and that with faded light, simply as a philosopher of the Cambridge stamp, and has left no proofs of pre-eminence in episcopal efficiency ; but we may conclude that he was devoted to his office from the anecdote, that, when in his old age his friends recommended retirement and rest, he said, “I will do my duty as long as I can ; I had better *wear* out than *rust* out.”

Something similar may be said of Fowler, an active opponent of James’ Declaration, promoted to the See of Gloucester in 1690, whose exposition of Latitudinarian theology has been described in a former volume. His broad views of Christianity, and his opposition to Popery, recommended him to a Bishopric. He is spoken of as a very respectable, but not very eminent, Prelate ; and what is curious in connection with his rationalism, he was credited with a faith in the existence of witches and fairies, “whom he dreaded

as much as the lady upon the seven hills, and all the scarlet train.”\*

Kidder, Bishop of Bath and Wells, had, before he wore a mitre, passed through circumstances which must have left a deep impress upon his character, and were calculated to impart moderation to his episcopal proceedings. He, in 1662, was deprived of his living for not subscribing to the Prayer-Book before he could examine it. Approving of it after examination, he pursued a chequered career, struggling with poverty, but exhibiting generous dispositions ; suffering during the plague year, but persevering in his spiritual duties, vexed by Nonconformists in his parish, yet administering the Lord’s Supper to those who refused to kneel. He paid half his income to ex-Bishop Ken ; and another circumstance is related which places his integrity in a conspicuous light. A message was sent him by a minister of King William, telling him he must give his vote in Parliament in a certain way. “Must vote !” “Yes, must vote : consider whose bread you eat.” “I eat no man’s bread but poor Dr. Ken’s ; and if he will take the oaths, he shall have it again. I did not think of going to the Parliament, but now I shall undoubtedly go, and vote contrary to your commands.”† The autobiography suggests the idea that Kidder was a well-meaning man, sometimes wanting in firmness and wisdom. His publications, which are numerous, include, besides his Boyle Lecture, Tracts against Popery, and Plain Treatises enforcing

\* Noble’s “Continuation,” II. 87, 88. In the “Lansdowne MSS., Kennet Coll.,” 987, 356, it is said Fowler “had a very superstitious fancy in catching at stories of apparitions and witches.”

† Kidder’s “Autobiography,” is printed in Cassan’s “Lives of the Bishops of Bath and Wells.”

the practice of a religious life. The only sermon of his which I have read, one preached at Court on the duty of fasting, suggests no high opinion of his pulpit power.

Amongst the Episcopal Divines of William's reign, only one can be considered as a decided Puritan. This was John Hall, Master of Pembroke, Oxford, who retained that position after he became Bishop of Bristol in 1691, a poor piece of preferment. He is far less noticeable as a Bishop than as a Theological Professor, in which capacity, however, he earned no enviable fame, even in the estimation of those who sympathized with him in his theological opinions; for Calamy says, that he brought all the theology of the Westminster Assembly out of the Church Catechism. He was a good man, laughed at by the wits, but esteemed for his godliness by pious people. Nicholas Stratford—possessed of learning, a firm supporter of the Church of England, and, judging of him by his primary visitation charge, an earnest preacher and a faithful pastor, bent on the salvation of souls—succeeded Cartwright in the Bishopric of Chester, in 1689; and in the same year, John Hough the Champion of Magdalen, rose to the episcopal chair of Oxford.\* An Archiepiscopal mitre rewarded, at the suggestion of Tillotson in 1691, the staunch Protestantism of Dr. Sharpe, the Dean of Norwich; and, if we are to believe all the encomiums on his virtues, inscribed upon his monument in York Cathedral, scarcely ever before did such a paragon of excellence exist.† Lloyd, Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry until 1699—when, on the death of Stilling-

\* A high character is given to Nicholas Stratford for kindness, courteousness, and charity, in "Lansdowne MSS., Kennet Coll.," 987, 304.

† This curious piece of eulogistic Latinity may be seen in Le Neve's "Archbishops," Part II. 286.

fleet, the King translated him to Worcester—is described by Whiston, who received ordination at his hands, as engaging in “a most uncommon, but vastly improving examination and instruction, in the Cathedral, beforehand.” Lloyd’s prophetical studies, vindicated by Whiston, exposed him to a good deal of raillery and satire. As with other students in the same school, his studies proved labour lost, for it is related that “his writings supplied the kitchen of his successor with fuel for many years ;” but his character defied detraction, and whilst revered for his virtues, that reverence was increased by his “learning and longevity.” \*

Politics, rather than Divinity, recommended men as Bishops under William III. They were constitutional Whigs sympathizing in the objects and promoting the interests of the Revolution. The anti-Papal zeal, and the readiness of most of them to conciliate Nonconformists, gave them favour in the eyes of both King and Queen ; nor should we overlook the influence of Tillotson and Burnet, the great ecclesiastical apostles of the period, in the advancement of these brethren. Sharpe’s promotion was owing to the former, probably Moore’s was owing to the latter. In point of personal character the new Prelates will bear comparison with their predecessors. Kidder indeed never enjoyed the reputation for sanctity possessed by Ken. Tillotson, Tenison, Burnet, Stillingfleet, Patrick, Cumberland, and Fowler, were in mental power superior to Sancroft, Thomas, Lake, White, and Frampton ; and as to personal religion, which admits not of precise judgment, there is no evidence that they were inferior. Stratford might easily surpass the disreputable Cartwright : the name of Hough is as illustrious as the

\* Noble’s “Continuation,” II. 82.

name of Samuel Parker is disgraceful, and the name of Timothy Hall obscure. In political bias, ecclesiastical feeling, and theological opinion, the new Prelates differed from their predecessors, and must therefore have imported into their dioceses some new methods of procedure.

I pass over Bishops more or less obscure, to notice one who attained an unenviable notoriety. This was Thomas Watson, Bishop of St. David's, who experienced the singular fate of being proceeded against in the Court of Arches, when he received a sentence of deprivation. He was convicted of applying to his own use offerings given at ordinations ; receiving what had been bestowed on servants as gratuities ; not administering oaths required by law ; ordaining at other times than the Sundays next Ember weeks ; conferring orders on a candidate below the canonical age ; exacting illegal fees ; and demanding excessive procurations. There must have been at the bottom of these proceedings much more than appears on the surface. He is reported to have been coarse and violent in his language and conduct, and to have thereby exposed himself to popular odium ; but these were not the things for which he was tried, nor was he formally accused of Popish opinions, though, in public estimation, he stood suspected of Romanist sympathies. He had been made a Bishop by James II., whose policy he approved, and this circumstance seems to have had much to do with the issue of his trial. He appealed to the House of Lords against the sentence of the spiritual court, but the sentence was confirmed. The case made much noise at the time, and excited a good deal of controversy. In a "Review" \* of it published by a friendly hand, the

\* This is entitled, "A Large Review of the Articles exhibited  
VOL. V.

charges brought against him are pronounced to be false, the veracity of the witnesses is impugned, and the whole process is described as a conspiracy carried on by “subornation,” and inspired by “political motives and inducements of pique and revenge.” The writer intends to suggest the animus of Watson’s prosecutors, by stating that he was asked what Papists and Non-jurors came to his house, and whether he had not drunk the health of King James; and I also find one deponent declaring that, in the oath of allegiance administered by the Bishop at an ordination, neither William nor Mary were mentioned by name. I cannot but think that political feeling prompted the prosecution; yet, if we look at the characters of such men as Tenison, Patrick, and others, who united in his condemnation, we must suppose that he had been guilty of great irregularities in his episcopal office.

There were to be found distinguished clergymen occupying parochial cures, clergymen eminent for learning, godliness, and zeal, amidst the bustle of a London life. Some were Anglican. William Beveridge, Rector of St. Peter’s, Cornhill, united with a profound reverence for antiquity an attachment to doctrinal truths dear to Puritans. He insisted upon Episcopacy, Sacraments, the observance of Lent, and fellowship with the Church of England, and he did this often in a narrow, hard, exclusive spirit; yet he sometimes preached sermons such as would be admired by modern Evangelicals.\* They exhibit no closeness

against the Bishop of St. David’s.” There is a MS. book, containing minutes of the charges, in the Cambridge University Library (MSS. 757). For the trial, see “Lord Raymond’s Reports,” I. 447; and Howel’s “State Trials,” XIV. 447. The deed of deprivation is in the Lambeth Library, 951, 6.

\* Compare for example Sermons IV. and XIV., “Works,” Vol. II.

of reasoning or sagacity of remark, no command of illustration, or felicity of style, yet they are sensible, unaffected, and somewhat forcible, from the manifest sincerity and earnestness of the author. Beveridge's "Thoughts on Religion" are perhaps the most edifying, certainly the best known of his works, though they were written when he was a young man; but as to terseness of expression, not as to breadth of thought, he appears, in my judgment, to more advantage in his "Ecclesia Anglicana, Ecclesia Catholica," a posthumous work on the Articles. In the exposition of the XI. Article, on Justification, he decidedly follows the Puritan lead; as to the XVII. Article, on Predestination, he is cautious, and his quotations, though they would not satisfy, do not condemn, Calvinistic Divines.

Down in the pleasant county of Gloucester, at the Rectory of Avening, George Bull, besides his literary labours—which before the end of the century won for him such high renown, that he was complimented by Bossuet—showed himself to be indefatigable in discharging pastoral duties, putting down country revels, and otherwise aiming at the improvement of his parishioners. In Wiltshire, John Norris, an English disciple of Malbranche, held the living of Bemerton; and, while he practised the quiet virtues of the parish priest, he selected for the pulpit, subjects of a moral and spiritual nature, rather than the more distinctive truths connected with our redemption by Christ; not but that there is a tone in Norris's teaching in unison with habits of thought cultivated by modern Evangelicals. His published discourses, for the most part, are plain and practical; yet sometimes his handling of topics is such as to make his readers think that he shot over

the heads of the Wiltshire farmers and peasantry. In Suffolk, William Burkett, Rector of Mildenhall, added to his ministerial excellence, large-hearted efforts for the French refugees, and for preaching the Gospel in America. He secured a long reputation by his "Expository Notes on the New Testament," which strongly reflect the opinions of others, and whilst decidedly Arminian, are more practical than critical. Of a well-known Kentish clergyman, Stanhope, Vicar of Lewisham, in no sense a party man, Evelyn remarks: "He is one of the most accomplished preachers I ever heard, for matter, eloquence, action, and voice."\*

One clergyman claims separate notice as a foreigner, a poor pluralist, and an exceedingly popular preacher. Dr. Horneck, a native of Bacharach, so familiar to all Rhine tourists, held, in conjunction with a stall at Exeter worth only twenty pounds a year, the preachership of the Savoy, which afforded but a miserable income. His poverty ended three years before his death, when, through the united kindness of Queen Mary and Archbishop Tillotson, he was made Prebendary of Westminster. But from first to last his ministry was exceedingly popular; it was no easy matter for him to get through the crowd to his pulpit. So great was the number of communicants at his church, that he had to seek the help of clergymen in the delivery of the bread and wine, "and with such assistance it was very late before the congregation could be dismissed."† His virtues are extolled in the epitaph inscribed on his monument in the Abbey.

Attempts were not wanting on the part of some of the Bishops to maintain ecclesiastical discipline.

\* "Diary," Nov. 10, 1695.

† "The Life of Dr. Horneck," by Bishop Kidder, 9, 10.

There are papers amongst the "Tanner MSS." which indicate what went on amidst the throes of the Revolution, in the diocese of Norwich, before the ejectionment of Bishop Lloyd. John Gibbs, Rector of Gissing, had been a convert to the Church of Rome; but on the 14th of November, nine days after the landing of the Prince of Orange, when Protestant East Anglicans would be exulting at the advent of the Deliverer, this recusant is referred to as wishing to be reconciled with the Church of his fathers; and a report is given of the sermon which he preached on the occasion.\* A little while afterwards an instance occurs of clerical immorality, and of that kind of trouble which has often disturbed episcopal peace: a Norwich rector was accused of "lewdness," amounting to a capital crime. The case was undoubted. It came to the Bishop's knowledge. To conceal the fact would have been to connive at the sin, to make it known to endanger the culprit's life. Indeed, to conceal it was no longer possible, and to stifle the charge was felt to be a scandal. The common tactics of defence were adopted by the accused. He appealed to his Archdeacon, with the view of gaining time, and by such means he cunningly slipped entirely out of the hands of the Consistory at Norwich. After the Revolution, we meet with a case in which discipline was exercised by Patrick, Bishop of Ely. The incumbent of Great Eversden had, by intemperance, drowned his reason and scandalized his profession. The Bishop required him to preach two penitential sermons. He did so, and concluded with the words: "You see, beloved, what a black indictment I have here drawnn up against myself, wherein I have not been favourable or partial

\* "Tanner MSS.," XXVIII. 248, 274.

to my fatal miscarriages, but have dissected and ripped up my many enormous crimes, and exposed them to public view. I beseech you not to be too censorious and uncharitable, since I have passed so severe a censure upon myself.”\*

Nothing like what is now called Ritualism had at the time of the Revolution any existence. No coloured vestments were worn by Anglicans, nor were there any attempts at extraordinary ornamentation of either altars or churches. The use of the surplice in the pulpit seems to have been a novelty. “Yesterday,” says the writer of a letter in 1696, “I saw in Low Leighton Church, that which to my remembrance I never did see in a Church in England but once, and that is a minister preach in a surplice for Mr. Harrison (whereas other ministers on Fast-days do not so much as wear any surplice), he, by way of supererogation, preached in his. The sight did stir up in me more of pity than anger to see the folly of the man; but if he preach in a fool’s coat we will go and hear him.”† Low Leighton (or Leyton) was the parish in which John Strype fulfilled his ministry, and therefore it was in the pulpit of that distinguished ecclesiologist, that the writer of the extract beheld the phenomenon which startled him out of his propriety; if the surplice was worn by the Incumbent, or with his sanction, the circumstance would indicate that he regarded the usage as canonical, however it might have fallen into abeyance. Amongst the Lambeth archives is a very long letter by Edmund Bowerman, Vicar of Codrington, who gives a curious account of his parish, of the extreme ignorance and

\* Patrick’s “Works,” IX. 546.

† 1696, April 7th. “Baumgartner Papers, Strype’s Correspondence,” III. 45.

irreligion of the people, and of their desecration of the church. They played cards on the communion-table, and when they met to choose churchwardens, sat with their hats on, smoking and drinking, the clerk gravely saying, with a pipe in his mouth, that such had been the practice for the last sixty years. Not ten persons in the place had ever received the Sacrament; one used to take it by himself in brown bread and small beer.\*

An important change took place in the psalmody of the Church of England. The archaic version of the Psalms, by Sternhold and Hopkins, kept possession in cathedral and parish congregations until the middle of the reign of William III. Attempts had been made at improving the versification. "A Century of Select Psalms," in verse, for the use of the Charter-house, by Dr. Patrick, appeared in 1679. Richard Goodridge followed him by a similar effort in 1682. Dr. Simon Ford, not to mention others, attempted something of the same kind in 1688. But a more successful enterprise was accomplished by Nicholas Brady and Nahum Tate, who, in 1695, published a tentative "Essay," and in 1696 a "Complete New Version," differing from such as they themselves had previously prepared. This version, afterwards so popular, did not escape criticism; but was most determinately opposed by Dr. Beveridge, who preferred the old rhymes of the Reformation to any modern rendering of the Songs of David. His course of argument, if it had any force, would be fatal to any attempt at improving scripture translations of different kinds.†

\* "Gibson Papers," V. 9. 1692, Dec. 17th.

† A "Defence of the Old Singing Psalms" may be found in the first volume of Beveridge's "Works," collected by Horne.

The character of the Clergy at that time has been drawn by different hands. Samuel Wesley, in the "Athenian Oracle," said, that out of fifty or threescore parishes with which he was acquainted, he could not think of above three or four clergymen who disgraced their office. The Nonjurors represented their brethren in the Establishment as newsmongers and busybodies, guilty of non-residence, faulty in their morals, and negligent of their duties. Some were often seen frequenting ale-houses and taverns, where they behaved disorderly. The communion in the London parish churches, before largely attended, was, according to the same authority, unfrequented; and in cathedral churches things were worse, so that the alms collected did little more than pay for the bread and wine.\* Nonjurors looked through a prejudiced medium at those who took the oaths. They regarded most of them as indifferent to a matter of immense importance, and not a few as deliberately dishonest, swearing to that which they did not believe. Men looking at the subject from another point of the compass, also came to an unfavourable conclusion. Whiston declared how well he remembered that by far the greater part of University members and clergymen took the oaths with a doubtful, if not an accusing, conscience.†

In judging of the Clergy of those days, we must take into account indirect evidence. The Convocation controversy, degenerating into a contemptible feud between class and class, or into a despicable squabble between clergyman and clergyman, proved the extensive existence of prejudice, obstinacy, and resentment, and must have drawn off the minds of many

\* "Life of Kettlewell," 213, 214.

† "Memoirs," 30.

from the discharge of their proper duties. Neither was the method of conducting controversy on more important points—the doctrine of the Trinity for example—at all calculated to preserve ministers of religion from injurious habits ; for the temper shown in books and tracts on this subject is most irreverent, most conceited, most uncharitable, most unchristian.

Turning from the character of the Clergy to notice their circumstances, we meet with an interesting picture of domestic life in the case of the father of the Wesleys. He was a rector upon £50 a year at South Ormsby, a little village in Lincolnshire, skirting the parks and woodlands of a goodly mansion. The same clergyman shortly afterwards was established in the county at the Rectory of Epworth, described, in a survey of the period, as consisting of “ five bays built all of timber and plaster, and covered with straw thatch, the whole building being contrived into three stories, and disposed into seven chief rooms, namely—a kitchen, a hall, a parlour, a buttery, and three large upper rooms, besides some others of common use, and also a little garden impaled between the stone wall and the south.”\* It is added that to the dwelling stood attached one barn of six bays, likewise built of clay and thatch, also one dovecote of timber and plaster, and one hempkiln. The glebe was stocked. Cows fed in the meadows, and pigs in the sty. A nag and two fillies occupied the stable, and flax and barley waved in the fields. The parishioners were, according to Wesley’s daughter, “ unpolished wights,” “ dull as asses,” and with heads “ impervious as stones.” The clerical dress, the rustic manner, and the lowly

\* “Anecdotes of the Wesley Family,” I. 207.

employments of the Rector, are portrayed by another member of the gifted family :—

“ To rub his cassock’s draggled tail,  
Or reach his hat from off the nail,  
Or seek the key to draw the ale,  
When damsel haps to steal it ;  
To burn his pipe, or mend his clothes,  
Or nicely darn his russet hose,  
For comfort of his aged toes,  
So fine they cannot feel it.”

The outlay upon taking the new living amounted to £50, just one-fourth of the annual income of the living. It was a practice for parish officers to compel people to lighten parochial burdens by taking, as apprentices, the children of paupers ; and one of these unfortunates was actually palmed on the Epworth Incumbent, who said he supposed he must teach the boy “to beat rhyme.” These items are worth mentioning as illustrations of the times, and in this case they are interesting in connection with the early life of the founder of Methodism and the master of English psalmody. At that time a mean-looking parsonage was the rule, not the exception : and even in the parish of Kensington, though honoured by the presence of Royalty, the vicarage is described as having been of a very humble character, with lattice windows. A large proportion of the livings were very poor, some as low as £14 or £15 per annum.\* Wesley’s first income was £30 a year from a curacy in London ; and if so small a sum was paid in the Metropolis, what must it have been in some of the provinces ! The pitiful condition of clergymen under Charles II. could have undergone no great improvement under William III. As in the

\* See Ecton’s “ *Liber Valorum*. ”

reign of Charles II., so in the reign of William III., the office of chaplain in the families of the great was not enviable. The salary was small, the position undignified, the treatment often disrespectful, and the means of usefulness limited and questionable. In the “Athenian Oracle,”\* the chaplain of a family not very regular or religious complains of the miseries of his situation ; he inquires what he ought to do, so as neither to betray religion nor give offence. He could not believe that to say grace and read prayers, when his patron was at leisure, constituted his duty, yet he found his brethren thought they had done enough when they had done no more than that. Thomas Wilson, afterwards Bishop of Sodor and Man, certainly took a different view, for when chaplain and tutor to Lord Derby, he, with commendable faithfulness, rebuked his pupil’s extravagance, so as to restore his reputation and relieve his creditors. Once, as the young nobleman was about to sign his name, he felt some melted sealing-wax dropped on his finger by this eccentric mentor, who remarked, that the pain ought to impress him with a resolution never to sign what he had never examined.†

Clerical costume is a trifle worth only a passing sentence, and it may be observed that it remained the same after the Revolution as before. But Archbishop Tillotson introduced a novelty. He is the first Prelate represented in a wig. The wig is of moderate dimensions, and not much unlike a head of natural hair. It is curious to find him remarking upon this innovation in one of his sermons. “I can remember, since the

\* I. 542, probably written by Samuel Wesley.

† Keble’s “Life of Wilson,” 61. The memory of Wilson is still cherished at Knowsley.

wearing the hair below the ears was looked upon as a sin of the first magnitude ; and when ministers generally, whatever their text was, did either find or make occasion to reprove the great sin of long hair ; and if they saw any one in the congregation guilty in that kind, they would point him out particularly, and *let fly at him* with great zeal.”\*

Whatever may be the relation between social corruption and clerical unpopularity, it is certain the two things co-existed. Nelson deplored a decay of the spirit and life of devotion ; † Thoresby declared that God seemed angry with the nation, as well He might, and so hid counsel from men, and left them to take such courses as would be neither for their own nor the public good : ‡ and Burnet relates, that profane wits were delighted at the circulation of books against the Trinity ; that it became a common thing to treat mysteries in religion as priestly contrivances ; and that, under cover of popular expressions, the enemies of religion vented their impieties. § Patrick lamented the prevalent coldness and carelessness in religion, “ scarce a handful of people appearing in many churches at Divine Service, when the playhouses were crowded every day with numerous spectators ; ” || and John Norris referred to the decay of Christian piety and the universal corruption of manners. Christ seemed to him asleep in the sacred vessel, while the tempest raged, and the waves almost overwhelmed the bark. Students of prophecy, regarding the state of Christianity as *anti-christianized*, anticipated the outpouring of the

\* Planché’s “ Hist. of British Costume,” 395.

† Preface to the “ Practice of True Devotion,” 1698.

‡ Thoresby, III. 153.

§ “ Hist. of his Own Time,” II. 211.

|| “ Works,” VIII. 451.

vials of wrath, the breaking-up of Christendom, and the replacement of God's chosen people the Jews, on the ruins of the Gentile Church.\*

Profane swearing so far prevailed, that it is said in many circles a man's discourse was hardly agreeable without it ; † and it is remarkable that instances given of John Howe's courtesy, and the wisdom with which he administered reproof, relates to the frequent utterance of oaths.‡ Intemperance, increasing from the time of the Restoration, continued to extend its curses towards the close of the eighteenth century ; old public-houses attracted more customers than ever, and many new ones were opened, the money spent in this way by the lower classes reaching an incredible amount.§ Sober people lamented that their neighbours were, with temperance, losing also that kindness of temper which had been prevalent amongst Englishmen. Numbers were in a state of superstition as immovable as that of their fathers, believing in the reality, and smitten with the terrors, of diabolical possession and infernal witchcraft. Even towards the end of William's reign, the diocese of Worcester was infected with this kind of faith ; and the Bishop, Dr. Lloyd, urged his Clergy to preach against errors respecting Satanic agency, indicating to them his own views on the subject. He did not doubt the extraordinary power of the Devil over heathen nations in ancient and modern times ; but he thought the Gospel had diminished his power ; that those who were in the covenant of grace could not be injured by him, either in their persons, their posses-

\* "Reason and Faith," Introduction.

† Wilson's "Life of De Foe," I. 262.

‡ See Roger's "Life of Howe."

§ Richard Dunning's "Bread for the Poor."

sions, or their children ; nevertheless he admitted that a man, by profligacy, might yield himself to the great enemy, but could not receive from him supernatural help to hurt anybody else.\* Lancashire continued the home of such beliefs, and in the middle of King William's reign, "a place in that county called Surrey" became powerfully agitated by the case of a lad, who stood upon his head, danced upon his knees, scrambled about on all fours, barked like a dog, talked shreds of Latin, ran into the water, and told things at a distance, all, it was said, the result of selling his soul to the Devil, in hopes of thereby becoming a first-rate dancer. The neighbours treated it as a real possession, and so did certain Presbyterian ministers, who appointed days of fasting and prayer on the youth's behalf, and continued them weekly for a twelvemonth. Folks from the country flocked in to see and hear the marvels going on, and made themselves merry at the expense of the fruitless intercessors ; they, in their turn, laid their want of success at the door of the boy's family, saying the witches were in league with Satan, and therefore supplication could not avail. The supposed demoniac named three Popish priests as likely to cure him, a circumstance which led the discomfited Presbyterians to say that the Devil had more mind to let the Popish priests have "the credit of casting him out, because his ends would be better served by Popery than by them." Foolish and wretched creatures now began to trade upon what had been a genuine belief,

\* "Letters Illustrative of the Reign of William III," by Vernon, Secretary of State, II. 302. I find amongst the "Tanner MSS.," XXVIII. 162, "Case of Sir Peter Gleanes' daughter, supposed to be suffering from witchcraft, Aug. 17, 1688."

and their conduct, whilst it showed that sincerity was parting company with superstition, helped to undermine faith in all such things. In London, still more disgusting exhibitions were made by people pretending to be possessed ; and in one case a miserable woman, through an accusation for witchcraft, had her hair torn off her head, and after being kicked and trampled on, was thrown into a horse-pond. A new result followed : instead of the supposed witch being punished, the pretended victim was. All sorts of pretences were shown up, and pretenders suffered the punishment they deserved, whilst poor old crones, bent double with age, escaped the river, the gallows, and the stake. Between 1640 and 1680, many unhappy creatures were punished for witchcraft. Between 1680 and 1691, three were hanged at Exeter, the last instance of capital punishment inflicted in England for this offence ; three were imprisoned in Somersetshire ; and several in other counties were ducked in horse-ponds. Afterwards, acquittals became common ; indeed, I find no more convictions in England during the reign of William III. ; on the other hand, I notice cases of people put in the pillory for pretending to be possessed.\* Very much of this change must be ascribed to the course pursued by Lord Chief Justice Holt. When he reached manhood, old prejudices had less power, the atmosphere of superstition was less dense ; and to him belongs the honour of having swept the dust and dirt of the whole business clean out of English courts for ever.

One piece of superstition maintained by English Sovereigns received a vigorous check, but not a death-

\* This information is gathered chiefly from Hutchinson's "Historical Essay concerning Witchcraft."

blow. I have described the ceremony of touching for the "king's evil," so ostentatiously revived by Charles II. His brother perpetuated the practice. The pecuniary benefit of submitting to the operation, no doubt, made it very popular, since it cost £10,000 a year for silver coins to be hung round the necks of patients. When, at the close of Lent, crowds besieged his doors, William exclaimed, "It is a silly superstition; give the poor creatures some money, and send them away." Once only could he be prevailed upon to touch a suppliant, when he added, "God give you better health, and more sense." There were not wanting some to reproach the King as cruel and impious, for refusing to exercise a Divine gift; but the Jacobites turned his conduct to account by saying, he did not dare to pretend to a power which only belonged to the Lord's anointed.

## CHAPTER IX.

COURSES of lectures on doctrinal and devotional themes had been fashionable with the Puritans. Robert Boyle, looking at the spread of infidelity, provided, by his will, for the appointment of a lecturer, to preach eight sermons in a year upon the evidences of Christianity; and thus set an example which has been followed by Bampton, Hulse, and others. The trustees, Tenison, then Bishop of Lincoln, and John Evelyn being two of them, selected for the first performance of the duty, a rising clergyman, already known in University circles by his vast attainments, and afterwards famous throughout the world of letters. Evelyn records the appointment in his "Diary," by saying "he made choice of one Mr. Bentley, chaplain to the Bishop of Worcester;" and the comparatively obscure student, so described, regarded it in after-life as the greatest honour with which he was ever invested. He determined to follow Cudworth and Cumberland without imitating them, to go down to the basis of all theology, and to confute the opinions of Hobbes and Spinoza. Bentley's Lectures, entitled, "A Confutation of Atheism," after exposing the folly of a godless belief, aimed at demonstrating the Divine existence from an inquiry into the faculties of the human soul, the structure of

the body, and the frame of the world. It was a movement along the line of rational thought. The Revolution had appealed to reason in matters of government. Without throwing aside traditions, even while appealing to constitutional forms, Englishmen were seeking after fundamental political principles; and reason came now to be earnestly invoked in the service of religion. Philosophy had been employed in attacking Christian beliefs; philosophy now came to the rescue. Faith in an infinite Cause, shaken by the human intellect, was to be reinforced by a more vigorous exercise of the same faculty.

Boyle, the founder of the Lecture, had collected scientific facts available for the lecturer's purpose. Locke, by illustrating the essential difference between matter and mind, had become a pioneer in the path along which Bentley pushed parts of his argument; and Newton, by his "Principia," had prepared for him methods by which to demonstrate the Creator's providence and goodness. Thus assisted, Bentley showed himself possessed of original genius; and having at command satire as well as logic, with a style adapted to give effect to his thoughts, he produced a deep impression by his discourses. The first he delivered at St. Martin's, the second at Bow Church. Before he published his work he wrote to the great philosopher, then resident in Trinity College, Cambridge. Newton corrected and modified Bentley's opinions upon some points, but he confirmed his views respecting most, and supplied him with additional arguments.\* Bentley soon afterwards obtained a stall in Worcester Cathedral, probably through the influence of Stillingfleet, his patron. If we are to believe his words, he had what

\* Monk's "Life of Bentley," 34.

was a better reward, for he says : "The Atheists were silent since that time, and sheltered themselves under Deism." It is a pity that historical justice requires it to be said that this advocate of natural theology did not possess the primary virtue of religion and the chief ornament of all learning. A nobleman happening one day to sit near Stillingfleet at dinner, observed to him, "My Lord, that chaplain of yours is certainly a very extraordinary man." "Yes," he replied ; "had he but the gift of humility, he would be the most extraordinary man in Europe."\*

According to the terms of Boyle's will, which authorized the appointment of the same lecturer for three years, Bentley might have delivered another course of sermons ; but owing, as it is said, to the favouritism of one of the trustees, and in opposition to Evelyn's wishes, Kidder, Bishop of Bath and Wells, delivered the second series, entitled, "A Demonstration of the Messias." Williams, afterwards made a Bishop, exhibited in his lectures "A General Idea of Revealed Religion." Gastrell, subsequently Bishop of Chester, a friend to Atterbury, and one who pleaded for him in Parliament, insisted upon "The Certainty and Necessity of Divine Religion." Dr. Harris refuted the objections of Atheists to the existence and attributes of God ; a superfluous task, it would seem, if we are to admit what has been said of the effect of Bentley's dissertations. Bradford, "the little ebony doctor," as he was called—an enemy of Atterbury's—discoursed upon the credibility of the Christian Religion. Blackhall, afterwards a Bishop, established and illustrated the sufficiency and perfection of the Old and New Testaments ; and Dr. Stanhope defended the truth and

\* Monk's "Life of Bentley," 37.

excellence of the Christian Religion against Jews, Infidels, and Heretics.

In 1695, Locke anonymously published his “Reasonableness of Christianity.” The appeal was made, not to authority, tradition, or history, but to reason. The main object was to present the simplest and most rational form of religion. He concluded, from his study of the Gospels, that the primary requirement is, that men should believe Jesus to be the Messiah, the anointed and sent of God; that such a belief makes every one a Christian; and that upon it the superstructure of Christian piety must ever rest. He objected to the enforcement of particular creeds, and he was opposed to all Church authority in reference to religion; though he spoke in general terms of salvation through Christ, he entered into no definition of evangelical doctrines, indeed such definitions he regarded as foreign to his purpose.

The book was attacked not by infidels but by believers, not by those who objected to Christianity but by those who, attaching importance to certain truths passed over by Locke, thought that he presented an objectionable view of the Gospel. He appeared to them to be a rationalist. Dr. Edwards, a clergyman of the Church of England, son of the famous Presbyterian who wrote the “Gangraena,” assailed the treatise with bitterness; and so great was its unpopularity in some quarters, that a Prelate, who thought of it favourably, candidly confessed: “If I should be known to think so, I should have my lawn sleeves torn from my shoulders.” Foreign divines, however, hailed it with applause, especially Dutch friends of the Remonstrant school, Le Clerc and Limborch. It found numerous readers abroad, and a Dorsetshire rector,

named Samuel Bold, though thoroughly orthodox on the subject of the Trinity, respecting which Locke laboured under some suspicion, took up his pen in defence of the lay theologian.

In his "Essay on the Human Understanding," he enters at large upon the question of the boundaries between reason and revelation, a question involved in what he says on the Reasonableness of Christianity, and asserts the principle, that revelation cannot be admitted against the clear evidence of reason, but then, immediately afterwards, he adopts the distinction between things contrary to reason and things above reason. Anything not contrary to reason, he contends, is to be believed if taught by revelation ; "whatever proposition," he says, "is revealed, of whose truth our mind, by its natural faculties and notions, cannot judge, that is purely matter of faith, and above reason." Indeed, Locke goes so far as to say, that in those things concerning which the mind "has but an uncertain evidence, and so is persuaded of their truth only upon probable grounds, which still admit a possibility of the contrary to be true, without doing violence to the certain evidence of its own knowledge and overturning the principles of all reason : in such probable propositions, I say, an evident revelation ought to determine our assent, even against probability." \*

Bentley and Locke added what was of the highest value to the literature of the Evidences. On a far lower intellectual level appeared Leslie, the Nonjuror, who, eschewing paths of reason, prepared to enter the path of history, and addressed himself to those of his

\* For further remarks on Locke, I refer the reader to my Volume on "The Worthies of Science."

countrymen who have little time for study and less capacity for reflection. In 1696 he published "A Short and Easy Method with the Deists," in which are laid down certain rules as to the truth of historical statements; and he contends that when they all meet, statements cannot be false. The work is of a very slight description, and is composed in a loose and inaccurate style. It could not meet the case of any who have adopted the principles of historical inquiry laid down by Voltaire and developed by Niebuhr, and by them applied to classical annals; nor could the method be applied by any critical student without great modification, and by an employment of learning, which would render the argument useless for popular purposes.

Charles Blount, after a side thrust at Christianity in his "Notes on Philostratus's Life of Apollonius Tyanaeus," left behind him papers, which were published in a book, entitled, "The Oracles of Reason," containing desultory attacks on revelation, chiefly in a covert form. Indeed, Blount quaintly observes: "Undoubtedly, in our travels to the other world, the common road is the safest; and though Deism is a good manuring of a man's conscience, yet certainly, if sowed with Christianity, it will produce the most plentiful crop." It is a curious fact that the editor and the publishers of these posthumous essays afterwards became convinced of their true character, and with a view to counteracting their effect issued the "Deist's Manual."

John Toland began his career as an author by writing his "Christianity not Mysterious," a discourse which represents that there is nothing in the Gospel contrary to reason nor above it, and that no Christian doctrine can be properly called a mystery. He does not appear as an antagonist of Christianity, perhaps he

had not yet begun to regard himself otherwise than as a Christian ; yet the tendency of his opinions is to undermine the authority of revelation. His book, which attracted wide attention, and was, as we have seen, condemned by the Lower House of Convocation, engaged the pen of the Bemerton Rector, John Norris, whose extraordinary metaphysical genius found scope for its exercise in examining Toland's lucubrations. His "Account of Reason and Faith, in Relation to the Mysteries of Christianity," is one of the ablest productions of the period, and displays great power of analysis, and a determination to reduce the powers of the human mind to their simplest form. Norris dwells upon the distinction of things contrary to reason and above it, showing that there is a valid ground for the distinction, that human reason is not the measure of truth ; that, therefore, a thing being incomprehensible by reason, is of itself no conclusive argument of its being untrue ; that if the incomprehensibility of a thing were an argument against it, human reason would become the measure of truth ; and, therefore, he concludes that incomprehensibility should not militate against faith. His mode of handling this subject, though extremely skilful and effective, is not always such as to bear a very close scrutiny ; and some modification of his argument is required, in order to a safe entrenchment against inimical attacks. But he successfully establishes this point, the fundamental one throughout the controversy, that it is perfectly reasonable and perfectly consonant with the laws and constitution of the human mind, to believe upon the authority of revelation, in other words, upon the authority of infinite wisdom.

In the course of this work I have had repeated occasions for noticing the theological literature of the period

—dogmatical, practical, and polemical. It will not be impertinent, in this stage of the subject, to remark respecting its form and style. The Renaissance had been at work in art and poetry, and had gradually supplanted the old romantic school. Gothic churches disappeared in the fire of London; those built on their ruins were classical reproductions. A new St. Paul's arose on Ludgate Hill, in contrast with old St. Peter's on Thorney Island. Multiplicity of parts, angularity of form, picturesqueness of detail, brilliancy of hue, gave place to regularity of outline, a mathematical exactness of proportion, smoothness of ornament, and absence of colour. No more pointed arches, no more niches, no more finials and crockets, no more richly-stained windows;—all became round, uniform, pale, cold. A similar change came over poetry. It were an indignity to the great bard of the seventeenth century to compare him with any other than the great bard of the sixteenth. Milton's name is linked with Shakespeare's, but in the way of contrast, just as St. Paul's Cathedral is associated with Westminster Abbey. The poet of the Renaissance succeeds the poet of romance. The architectural character of the two buildings symbolize the characteristic differences of the two masters of English song. And this same Renaissance spirit worked its way into theological literature. Taylor and Bunyan, indeed all the great religious writers of the Commonwealth and the Restoration, appear more or less romancists in the style of their thoughts, regarded from a literary point of view. Divisions, pointedness, quaint expression, warmth of sentiment, such as arrests us in mediæval buildings are reproduced in the books of that picturesque age. The two authors just mentioned belong to the class of romancist prose poets. But all

is changed when we turn to the theological literature of King William's days—Tillotson, Burnet, Bentley, Locke. We miss Anglican and Puritan sweep of thought, minuteness of detail, intensity of utterance, and glow of passion. There is no depth of colour, all is pale ; no flash of fire, all is cold. We meet with regularity, order, smoothness. It is the age of Renaissance in Divinity.

## CHAPTER X.

ROMAN Catholicism, during the Middle Ages, had given scope to the institution, and had paid attention to the culture, of voluntary societies. Such societies had sprung up in different parts of Europe amongst the Clergy and amongst the Laity, being placed in subjection to the laws, animated by sympathy with the spirit, and directed to the promotion of the interests of the Church. Monks praying in cloisters, friars preaching in streets, secular fraternities in towns and cities visiting the poor and sick, had engaged in spontaneous activity, yet had remained faithful to their spiritual mother. English Protestantism, at first, did not produce or encourage any such forms of operation. Cathedral and parochial clergymen, in dignified or humble routine, were its only authorized agents. Missionary efforts, foreign and domestic, as well as lay associations for spiritual improvement were unknown. In one ascertained exceptional instance, under Edward VI., an unordained person was allowed to preach ; but it was the rule to exclude all but men in orders from every kind of public or socially organized usefulness. Not only were Anglicans destitute of any association of lay helpers in Christian work at home, and of any means for carrying on Missions abroad, but Puritans were in the same predicament, since meetings for

prophesying, catechizing, and lecturing, and plans for purchasing presentations to livings, did not constitute the kind of co-operation now in view. Presbyterians and many Independents also, not only from necessity, but from that neglect of unclerical enterprise which characterized the age, confined themselves, with few exceptions, to pulpit teaching and pastoral influences. High Church and Low Church, the Establishment and the sects, exhibited disregard of a principle in full play in other portions of Western Christendom. A clerical jealousy of laymen, a fear of schism, and a dislike of everything approaching to irregularity, lay at the bottom of the Anglican aversion to lay agency. Prejudices of a similar kind influenced Puritans ; for although there existed abundant religious irregularity during the Commonwealth, there were not a few amongst Non-conformists wedded to their own notions of church order. They were High Churchmen in their own way, regarding the ecclesiastical principles of the New Testament as so comprehensive in their direct application, as to render all associations distinguished from the Church itself as perfectly needless. This state of things prevailed during three-fourths of the seventeenth century, when a movement began, opening the way to consequences which ever since have been unfolding themselves. At present, the vast number of our religious societies, some in slender connection with churches, some in no connection with them at all, form phenomena worth the study of social philosophers ; and the rise of them may be distinctly traced in those combinations for certain purposes, just before and during the reign of William III., which are now to be described. The outburst of zeal at that time has received much less notice than its importance deserves.

It was about the year 1678, sixty years after the first establishment in Paris of the societies by St. Vincent de Paul, that a few young men in London, belonging to the congregations of Dr. Horneck, the popular preacher at the Savoy, and of Mr. Smithies, an impressive lecturer at St. Michael's, Cornhill, came under one of those inspirations which mark epochs of revival. They agreed to meet weekly for religious conference, prayer, and scripture reading. When, under James II., signs of Papal outgrowths were visible, they sought to check returning superstition, and promoted the use of daily common prayer at the church of St. Clement Danes, as a sort of protest against the use of daily mass at the Chapel Royal. Feeling a more than ordinary desire for the Communion, they frequented the Lord's-table whenever they had an opportunity, and stimulated clergymen to celebrate, not only upon Sundays but upon holidays; and on the vigils of feasts they met for preparation at one another's houses. They thus fell in with a current of sacramental feeling, which became prevalent and powerful at the opening of the eighteenth century, promoted by the writings of Robert Nelson and others, and by the example of distinguished persons amongst both Clergy and Laity.\* They also raised money for the payment of clergymen who read prayers, for the relief of the poor, for the support of schools, and for the spread of Christianity abroad and at home. They laid down rules of conduct, drawn from their own religious and ecclesiastical principles. Controverted points of Divinity were banished from discussion, no prayers were used but those in the Prayer-Book, or sanctioned by

\* Numerous illustrations are afforded in Secretan's "Life of Nelson," 174.

clergymen; the strong Church element in these societies further manifesting itself in careful abstinence from a lay use of absolution.

The societies, developed in the way described, attained vigour and prosperity in the middle of King William's reign, being promoted by the approval of Queen Mary, who took a deep interest in their proceedings. Thirty-nine of them were instituted in London and Westminster. They spread into the midland and western counties; we find them at Nottingham and Gloucester, and we follow them across the Channel to Ireland, to Kilkenny and Drogheda, especially to Dublin, where no less than ten of them arose under the sanction and help of the Bishops and Clergy.\* Tillotson, Compton, and other Prelates, at an early period looked favourably upon the associations and aided their endeavours; but some at first were shy. Archbishop Sharpe, for example, and other clergymen, both Bishops and Presbyters, frowned upon all movements of the kind, as violations of order and as productive of schism. Amongst the lay promoters of these societies, Robert Nelson becomes conspicuous after the year 1700, when he abandoned the Nonjuring party.

Another kind of society, originated about the year 1691, not intended, like the Young Men's Associations, for personal religious improvement, but for checking public immorality, was formed so as to include Non-conformists. The methods of operation were manifold. The most prominent was to enforce the execution of the laws against vice and profanity; and to stir up

\* See Woodward's "Account of the Rise and Progress of Religious Societies, etc., and of their Endeavours for Reformation of Manners;" Dr. Horneck's "Life"; Toulmin, 415; Secretan's "Life of Nelson," 91.

people to join in this enforcement, the utmost ingenuity and the most plausible eloquence were employed. An abstract of statutes against a profanation of the Lord's-day, against drunkenness, swearing or cursing, against blasphemy, and disorderly practices; also against gaming, was published and circulated, with a list of penalties annexed; and all good subjects were exhorted, on grounds of patriotism and religion, to aid in executing these statutes. Other associations were formed for the same purpose. Persons of eminence, members of Parliament, justices of the peace, and London citizens, constituted one division of the army enlisted in the service of public morals; they chiefly furnished the supplies for carrying on the war. About fifty persons, including tradesmen and others, composed a second band, to promote, by individual efforts, the prosecution of the design. A third detachment embraced constables, who were "to meet to consider of the most effectual way to discharge their oaths, to acquaint one another with the difficulties they met with, to resolve on proper remedies, to divide themselves in the several parts of the city so as to take in the whole to the best advantage for inspecting of disorderly houses, taking up of drunkards, lewd persons, profaners of the Lord's-day, and swearers out of the streets and markets, and carrying them before the magistrates." A fourth rank of men, described as the corner-stone of the undertaking, contained as many as were disposed to inform against delinquents; the money arising from informations being devoted to the help of the poor, except a third part of the penalty against Sabbath-breaking, which the magistrate had the power to distribute, but which had never, so it was said, been bestowed upon the informers themselves.

The result of the prosecutions was such that the good people, working in this way, regarded themselves as very successful. Seventy or eighty warrants a week were executed upon strict swearers, so that the constables "found it difficult to take up a swearer in divers of our streets." Sunday markets ceased ; drovers and carriers were stopped ; bakers did not dare to appear with their baskets, or " barbers with their pot, basin, or periwig-box ;" hundreds of bad houses became closed ; and "thousands of lewd persons were imprisoned, fined, and whipped, and the Tower end of the town much purged from that pestilential generation of night-walkers, forty or fifty of them being sent in a week to Bridewell, from whence, at their own desire, they were transported to America to gain an honest livelihood in the plantations."

Means of another and a much better kind were employed for the furtherance of the general object. A hundred thousand short tracts against drunkenness and other vices were distributed throughout the country, and especial care was taken to present them to culprits after their conviction. Connected with this enterprise appears the germ of another usage, the preaching of sermons on particular occasions in behalf of societies. With eloquence, or with varying degrees in the want of it ; with spirit, or with dulness ; with a pleasant voice, as of one who can play well on an instrument, or with an unmusical delivery, which grated harshly on sensitive ears,—did clergymen in Bow Street and Nonconformist ministers at Salters' Hall stand up before congregations, crowded or scanty, charmed or disappointed, enthusiastic or critical. Then as now, secretaries would be filled with anxiety, committees would listen with a feeling of responsibility, praises and

censures would follow the appeals, complacency would be inspired, mortification would be provoked, thanks would be returned ; and the good and evil, the grace and the frailty, the virtues and the infirmities incident to such occasions would begin to manifest themselves on a small scale, in prophetic type of what obtains in the May anniversaries of the nineteenth century.

There were not wanting Churchmen who fixed a jealous eye on these proceedings, seeing that they combined Conformists and Nonconformists in works of charity. The goodness of the object did not prevent disapproval of union with schismatics. Archbishop Sharpe, whose suspicions as to the Young Men's Societies have been already mentioned, refused to countenance in any way those on a broader basis ; and Henry Newcome, son of the eminent Presbyterian of that name, when preaching a Reformation Lecture, railed against Dissenters, a circumstance which led Matthew Henry to say, "The Lord be judge between us. Perhaps it will be found that the body of Dissenters have been the strongest bulwarks against profaneness in England." The co-operation of Churchmen and Dissenters excited political suspicion ; and Vernon, Secretary of State, by no means friendly to such movements, told the Duke of Shrewsbury that the Archbishop apprehended their design was to undermine the Church, and that the Lord Chancellor thought they rather aimed at discrediting the Administration. Even William approved of a watch being kept over the movement, and Somers was for finding out all ways of getting into their secret, and by clandestine means to defeat clandestine objects. Not that Dissenters were suspected of treason, but his Lordship wished to know "what discontented Churchmen or discarded

statesmen meant by insinuating themselves into their familiarities.” \*

In one instance the activity of the reformers occasioned a riot. May Fair reached its zenith in the reign of William III., when, in addition to the sale of leather and cattle, all sorts of exhibitions took place adapted to high and low, rich and poor. Graceful dancers attracted noblemen ; duck-hunting in a pond at the back of a wooden house which then, in rural simplicity, stood in what is now the heart of a West-end population, drew together crowds of the vulgar. Informers, constables, and magistrates were busy at their work, apprehending the worst offenders, and no doubt plenty they found to do, for it is stated by a contemporary that young people, by the temptation they met with here, committed much sin, and fell into much disorder.† The consequence of the excitement produced by the reformers was, that a set of ruffians, including a number of soldiers, swore at the constables, drew swords, made an assault, killed one, and wounded several. The man who slew the constable was hanged.

At the close of the year 1698 an organization more important than any of the preceding took its rise. Dr. Bray and four distinguished friends, Lord Guildford, Sir Humphrey Mackworth, Mr. Justice Hook, and Colonel Maynard Colchester, drew up a document, by which they agreed to consult together to promote Christian knowledge. As the purpose was comprehensive, and the means remained to be arranged, a principle of selectness appeared essential to success ; and, accordingly, the possession of “ noted humility, condescension, and charity,” was laid down as essential

\* Vernon, “Correspondence,” II. 128-130.

† Strype’s “Stowe,” II. 578.

to membership. A candidate was proposed at two meetings before admission. Eminent persons, including Prelates, Presbyters, and Laymen, joined the new association. Thus commenced the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. Manifold were the methods adopted at the beginning, and various schemes were from time to time discussed. The circulation of tracts, the establishment of parochial libraries in America to aid the work of the Clergy, and the establishment of lending libraries in market towns of this kingdom, together with the distribution of good books, as the Society should direct, are objects mentioned in the minutes. Catechetical schools in and about London received attention ; and before the end of the year 1699 it was reported that in White-chapel, Poplar, St. Martin's, Cripplegate, Shadwell, Shoreditch, and Bishopsgate, they had been set up through the Society's operations. Whilst the promotion of Christian knowledge, by means of publications and schools, formed the main object of the Society, other purposes were incidentally contemplated, and we find these good men anticipating the labours of John Howard by seeking to improve the state of prisons, and the modern condemnation of duelling. Numerous references occur in the earliest proceedings to efforts for the conversion of Quakers. There was a man named George Keith, a native of Aberdeen, and a fellow-student with Gilbert Burnet at the University of that city. He went over to America, and pursued a distinguished course as a preacher amongst the Quakers ; but disputes arose between him and the Pennsylvanian Friends, which ended in their disowning him. Strange to say, after protesting against American Friends, this energetic person became a

member of the Church of England, and entered into holy orders. He now became a zealous opponent of the people with whom he had been identified, and being brought into intimate connection with Dr. Bray, that gentleman considered him a suitable agent for the new Society. Whether the Society originally designed him for the purpose or not, certainly Keith deemed it his vocation to do all in his power to bring Quakers within the pale of the English Church, and the records of the Society endorse his efforts in this respect. Quakers are not the only persons whose conversion was specially contemplated ; particular attention was paid to Roman Catholics, and it was agreed that the members of the Society should endeavour to inform themselves of the practices of priests to pervert His Majesty's subjects.

The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge was the parent of another society of not less importance. Dr. Bray was deeply interested in Missions abroad ; with extraordinary efforts for the diffusion of the Gospel in England, he combined extraordinary efforts for the diffusion of the Gospel in the American colonies. He went out to Maryland at his own expense, as Ecclesiastical Commissary to the Bishop of London, and did not return to England until after he had exhausted his resources. It appears that in March, 1697, when a Bill was being read in Parliament respecting estates devoted to superstitious uses, he presented a petition, praying that a portion of such estates might be set apart for the propagation of the reformed religion in Maryland, Virginia, and the Lee-ward Isles, or that some other provision should be made for the purpose. Animated by this spirit, he induced the Society to approve of libraries in North

America for the use of the Clergy. At length, floating desires assumed definite shape, and steps were taken to secure a charter for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts. Dr. Bray, through the instrumentality of Archbishop Tenison and Bishop Compton, succeeded in accomplishing this object. Repeated conferences took place touching points connected with the new undertaking ; and on the 9th of June, Dr. Bray stated that His Majesty in Council had signed an order for incorporating the Society.\* Convocation had turned its thoughts to Foreign Missions, but relinquished further proceedings upon finding this charter was granted. The instrument described as one object of the Society, the provision of learned and orthodox ministers for the administration of God's word and sacraments amongst the King's loving subjects in the plantations, colonies, and factories beyond the seas. It further contemplated the propagation of the Gospel in foreign parts ; and this, read in the light of subsequent operations, might be interpreted to signify the diffusion of Christian knowledge amongst such of the heathen as lived in the neighbourhood of English colonists. Missions to distant pagan countries scarcely came within the range of Christian thoughtfulness and enterprise at that period, but to the honour of Samuel Wesley of Epworth, be it said, he suggested a scheme for the conversion of Jews, of Mohammedans, and of heathens, "who might be reached by the Evangelical agency of the Church of England, in the vast regions which lie between St. Helena and Abyssinia, the East Indies, and China."†

\* Much of this account, like the former, rests upon the minutes of the S.P.C.K., from which extracts have been kindly furnished.

† Smith's "Hist. of Wesleyan Methodism," I. 81.

Under the presidency of his Grace of Canterbury, a meeting of members took place at Lambeth Palace on the 27th of June, 1701 ; and we can fancy Compton, Williams, Fowler, Sherlock, and others, coming in barges along the Thames, or in coaches, on horseback, or a-foot through the narrow streets, to the well-known gateway of the Archiepiscopal abode. According to a vote on the occasion, there was prepared a symbolical seal, representing a ship in full sail, with a gigantic clergyman, half-mast high, standing by the bowsprit with an open Bible in his hands, whilst diminutive negroes, in an attitude of expectancy, are sprinkled over a hilly beach. Overhead is one of those awkward scrolls, devised to convey words uttered by the persons introduced ; and here it contains in Latin the Macedonian prayer, which the little blacks are supposed to be offering : "Come over and help us." At the top is a face surrounded by sun rays, apparently intended to denote the presence and benediction of God vouchsafed to the undertaking. Meetings afterwards were held at the Cockpit, in Whitehall, or in the vestry of Bow Church, and afterwards in Archbishop Tenison's library, in St. Martin's-in-the-Fields.

## CHAPTER XI.

A BOLD step taken by the Nonjurors in the year 1694 deepened and perpetuated their schism, and some circumstances tainted their proceedings with more disloyalty than could be involved in the mere refusal of an oath. Sancroft, as if copying Romish pretensions, had appointed Lloyd, ex-Bishop of Norwich, his "Vicar," "Factor," "Proxy-General," or "Nuncio." Lloyd accordingly proceeded, in concert with the deprived Prelates of Peterborough and Ely, to appoint two Bishops. To soften appearances and to avoid collisions, they gave the persons appointed the titles of Suffragans of Thetford and of Ipswich, and, in keeping with their own Jacobitism, they consulted the Royal Exile respecting those who should fill the offices. Dr. Hickes was despatched on a visit to St. Germains, with a list of the Nonjurors, to ask James to exercise the prerogative by nominating two clergymen for these posts. He graciously received the delegate, who spent six weeks in travelling that short distance, and in overcoming the difficulties of access to his Court. Having consulted the Pope, the Archbishop of Paris, and Bossuet of Meaux, whether it would be consistent with loyalty to the Church to do what was asked, James, with their sanction, nominated Hickes as Suffragan of Thetford, and Wagstaffe as

Suffragan of Ipswich.\* It is plain that James made capital out of this to further his own designs, for he was at that time deep in plans of invasion, and his correspondence with Hickes and the Bishop of Norwich points to them as accredited agents.† On the 24th of February, 1694, Hickes and Wagstaffe were admitted into the Episcopal order by the three deprived Bishops, and the ceremony took place in a private house in London, where the Bishop of Peterborough lodged, the Earl of Clarendon being present on the occasion.

Great care was taken by some of the Nonjurors to ascertain the number and circumstances of clergymen included within their party. It is the effect of such ecclesiastical divisions to bring into bonds of closest acquaintance those who agree upon some distinctive principle. Amongst the "Baker MSS." is a document containing a long list of those who forfeited their preferment rather than take the new oath.‡ Of the names given, some are reported as "poor," others as "not poor," or as "well to pass."

The Nonjurors fixed their headquarters in the Metropolis, where Kettlewell settled after leaving his incumbency. With all his ardour he did not practically go so far as some of his brethren. He objected to the clergy attending parish churches, because, as he said, if only two or three joined them in private, they might canonically minister, and have Christ in the midst of them; but he did not object to the laity uniting in worship with clergymen who took the oaths. Upon examining the ground of this concession, we find it

\* Mason's "Defence," by Lindsay, Preface.

† Macpherson's "Original Papers," I. 452.

‡ It is written by Hen. Wilkinson, and dated October 25, 1690.  
("Baker MSS.," 40, 91, Cambridge University Library.)

rests on the idea that the ministration of the ordained is essential to the Divine acceptance of social service, and the public devotion in which he allowed the laity to participate only consisted of common prayer on ordinary occasions.\* He would in no way sanction the use of intercession for William and Mary, and was himself very particular in praying not only for King James, but in obeying the order issued before the Revolution, for supplications on behalf of the Prince of Wales. He pushed his views of the individual responsibility of clergymen, and, if I understand him aright, of laymen as well, to such an extent that he reached a position of thorough independency ; for he says, true and faithful pastors are not bound to keep up external unity and peace, and that however private persons are to use modesty and caution in following the “venerable ecclesiastical judicatories on earth, yet it is not any *implicit dependence* on men, or a *blind obedience* to any human sentence or decision whatsoever, but observance of the truth itself, and of what God hath in His Word decided, that must justify them in determining themselves whom they are to follow.”† This is the protestantism of the Protestant Religion, the dissidence of dissent, and it affords an example of the odd way in which extremes meet. Kettlewell, in fact, had become a Nonconformist, and he justified himself only by arguments of the same description as those which other Nonconformists employ.

Kettlewell entered with sympathy into the poverty and sufferings of his brethren. They had many of them lost all, and this benevolent man, anxious to assuage their distress, drew up a plan for collecting

\* Kettlewell's “Works,” II. 635–638.

† “Life of Kettlewell,” 317.

and distributing a fund for their relief, directing inquiries as to the income and expenditure of the deprived, with a view to prevent impositions upon charity. He proposed that the Clergy in London, who had no business there, but remained only because it was the best place for obtaining gifts, should be sent where they would be better maintained at less expense, and where they might make themselves of some service. Then, touching upon a notorious evil, he remarked, that others would then have no excuse for frequenting coffee-houses and hunting after benefactions, but would have time to promote their own improvement, and he advised those who sought relief, simply to note their sufferings, without making reflections.\* He did not confine himself to sectarian charity, but sought to promote the welfare of persons not of his own communion, of which a monument remained after his death, in a comprehensive trust, of which he was the founder.† Kettlewell remained a Nonjuror to the last, and on his death-bed expressed his distinctive principles; but he did something better, and beautifully uttered the language of Christian hope. His scheme of charitable relief received the sanction of the Nonjuring Bishops, who wrote a letter in its favour. The proceeding was laudable; yet such was the political antipathy to the Nonjurors by those in power, that Ken had to appear before the Privy Council to account for putting his name to the appeal; and of the interrogations he received and the answers he gave, there remains a report under his own hand.

Dodwell threw his whole soul into the Nonjuring

\* Kettlewell's "Works," I., Appendix.

† "Miscellaneous Papers of Dr. Birch," Brit. Mus., 4297. Secretan's "Life of Nelson," 52.

cause, and after the schism had occurred continued on its behalf the advocacy he had undertaken at the beginning. His pen was busy with denunciations and encouragements ; in private letters to those whom he suspected of timidity, he deplored the general apostacy from Church principles ; described the apostates as pretending to the name of the Church of England, whilst acting on the principles of its adversaries ; spoke of latitudinarian notions as tincturing those of the laity who were so warm for what they call liberty of conscience ; and expressed his deep sorrow for what he considered vacillation and cowardice. He denounced all compliance, eschewed all compromise, reprobated all “carnal politics,” and warned against balancing expediency with conscience.\* He set aside reasons for taking the oaths, by saying there is no cause so bad but something may be said in its support ; as an illustration of the lengths to which party spirit will carry people, I may cite the following words from his vehement lucubration : “It is not a particular sect or opinion that we contend for, but the very being of a Church and of religion. Whether there be any understanding men who, in this incredulous age, can find in their hearts to venture the greatest worldly interest for their religion,—that is, indeed, whether there be any that are in earnest with religion ?”†

As to prayers for the reigning family, so strongly objected to by Kettlewell, Dodwell did not regard them as obliging a separation. He admitted the right of public offices to belong to governors, and that though differing from their subjects they might be included in their intercessions. He in the first instance

\* Dodwell to Ken, “Baker MSS.,” 40, 82, et seq.

† Dodwell to Sherlock, “Baker MSS.,” 86, et seq.

suggested, if the reconciliation could be effected, that the remaining deprived Bishops should "hold their places, with a third part of the profits, without taking the oaths;" and then said at last, "If you will do nothing on your part to qualify you for union with us, our fathers will have performed their part, and you alone must be answerable for the consequences of it."\* Hickes, Suffragan Bishop of Thetford, resided in Ormond Street, exerting an influence very different from that of Ken, Kettlewell, and Nelson; for whilst they kept aloof from political intrigues, he plunged deeply into the eddying whirlpool, and whilst they allowed the laity to attend parish churches, he denounced those who did so. He most absurdly maintained that even when no State prayers occurred in the service, simply to hold fellowship with schismatics—and such he denominated all except Nonjurors—was a flagrant betrayal of Christian principle.† On another point he was at variance with Kettlewell. Hickes thought it lawful to wear a military disguise that he might escape detection, and once was introduced, in Kettlewell's presence, as Captain or Colonel Somebody, for which a patriotic precedent was characteristically alleged, by quoting the case of a certain Bishop of old, who, amidst an Arian persecution, assumed a military title. Nor did Turner object to the practice of absconding under borrowed names. But against everything of this kind the severely truthful Kettlewell set his face like a flint, and would not have swerved a hair's-breadth from the straightest line of honesty to save his life.‡

\* Lambeth Library. "Gibson Papers," II. 38-41.

† "Life of Ken," by a Layman, 409.

‡ "Life of Kettlewell," 471.

Eccentric individuals might be found amongst those who, by Nonjuring sympathies, were drawn together in a city then, as now, containing social worlds, scarcely by any chance touching each other. Such precisians cut themselves off from general intercourse and form narrow-minded habits, which satisfy their own consciences, but provoke the ridicule of other people. Amongst those who in William's reign often met together and talked over the affairs of the deprived Clergy, occurs the name of Dr. Francis Lee, Rabbi Lee, as he came to be called, because of his Jewish learning. He had been deprived of a fellowship at St. John's College, Oxford, and after travelling abroad and practising as a physician in Venice for a couple of years, had returned to London in 1694, when he joined a company of Mystics, and married the prophetess of the sect, a wild sort of lady, who imagined that she received revelations from God and from angels, and had been taught by them the finite duration of future punishment. Besides this species of modern Montanism, Lee adopted peculiar opinions on other subjects, and published proposals to Peter the Great, Czar of Muscovy, for the better framing of his extensive government.

No layman attained such a position amongst the Nonjurors as Robert Nelson, pupil of the Anglican Dr. George Bull, and friend of Dr. Mapleton, who had been educated in the family of his great-uncle Nicholas Farrer, of Gidding. He early imbibed influences favourable to the adoption of High Church views. His friendship with the Latitudinarian Archbishop Tillotson, and with the half-Puritan Bishop Kidder, might hold in check for a while prior tendencies, but could not prevent their ultimately producing effect. His personal

regard for Tillotson lasted till death, he held the Primate in his arms at the moment he expired ; yet then all Nelson's deference to his opinions had ceased, for from the crisis of the Revolution he had been a Nonjuring Jacobite. The conversion to Popery of his wife, an aristocratic widow, the Lady Theophila Lucy, who had become violently enamoured of his handsome person, did not incline him at all towards Rome, though it could not prove inimical to the development of his Catholic tendencies. Of his intense devoutness and religious zeal there can be no doubt, nor of his respectable abilities ; and the importance of such an accession to the new sect was heightened by other circumstances. No one can look at his portrait without admiring the taste of Lady Lucy. His fine features, set off to advantage by a good complexion and the adventitious decoration of a magnificent wig, must have given him an imposing presence. That presence was further aided by the taste and expensiveness of his apparel, to which should be added the recollection of his wealth and his aristocratic connections. Thus fitted to make his way in society, he naturally became amongst poor and persecuted people a commanding personage—an oracle with some, a counsellor with all. He associated with Lloyd, corresponded with Frampton, was acquainted with Ken, for Kettlewell he felt a warm attachment ; Collier and Spinckes were numbered amongst his friends, and Hickes lived close neighbour to him in Ormond Street, Red Lion Fields.

In his previous residence at Blackheath Nelson wrote books by which he has become well known to posterity. Few may have heard of "The Practice of True Devotion," which he anonymously published in 1698, or of his "Exhortation to Housekeepers," which appeared

in 1702 ; but a lasting fame has followed his “Companion for the Festivals and Fasts,” which issued from the press in 1704. The production is pervaded with a cast of thought which, though pre-eminently cherished by Nonjurors, was not peculiar to them. Nelson believed that the Episcopal Church of England is the great conservator of orthodoxy, that her Prayer-Book is an unparalleled help to devotion, that Sacraments lie at the centre of Christianity, and that holy days are seasons of blessed revival. He wrote accordingly ; and what he wrote was acceptable to members outside his own circle, not only on account of their sympathy with his Church views, but because there lay at the bottom of it this true idea—that theology should be the handmaid of devotion, that faith finds expression in worship, that religion is not a metaphysical idea, but a life which pours itself out in prayer and praise before God, and in justice and charity towards man. In a literary point of view his popular books can pretend to little, if any merit. The form of question and answer, as bare as any catechism, gives it no attraction ; and, for whatever learning may be found in its pages, the reader is indebted not to Robert Nelson, but to Dr. Cave.

Nonjuring circles in the Metropolis must often have been agitated by rumours of plots, real or imagined. In the saloons of Jacobite nobles, in the back rooms of city shops, in the garrets of Little Britain, stories would be whispered of preparations made for restoring the legitimate Sovereign. In the autumn of 1698 such tales reached the ears of the Duke of Shrewsbury’s Secretary. A Jacobite party had provided sixty horses : these were dispersed in Kent and about town, some in the hands of jockeys. They had engaged a

Canterbury innkeeper to help onward their project, had raised a fund of above £1000, were on the tiptoe of expectation, and only waited for a signal to mount their steeds and be off like the wind. So the Secretary heard, and, in connection with the retailing of all this talk, he stated, that he was on the point of apprehending a person who dealt in policies of insurance upon James's restoration. He paid a guinea, so runs the letter, to receive fifty if the King or his son should reascend the throne by the following Michaelmas, certainly a strange scheme for promoting his return, since it became the interest of every one who received the guinea to keep the Royal refugee away.\*

Centres of Nonjuring influence and activity existed in the country. Shottesbrook Park, near Maidenhead, with its beautiful church of decorated Gothic, and its manor-house full of convenience and comfort, the home of Francis Cherry, a country gentleman, both handsome and accomplished, "the idol of Berkshire," offered a pleasant retreat for the deprived.† Many could be accommodated within the spacious Hall, for it contained not less than seventy beds; and the owner was as free in his hospitality as he was rich in his resources. His heart went with the exiled King, and a story is told to the effect that once, in a hunting-field, when closely pressed by William's steed, he plunged into the Thames where the river was deep and broad, hoping that the piqued monarch might be induced to follow through the uncomfortable if not perilous passage. To Shottesbrook House, Robert Nelson often

\* Dated Oct. 22, 1698. "Letters Illustrative of the Reign of William III.," by James Vernon, Secretary of State, II. 203.

† For several particulars in this account I am indebted to Secretan's "Life of Nelson."

repaired. There the Nonjuror Charles Leslie found a welcome, and at a later period than this volume embraces, disguised in regimentals, when, in danger of apprehension, he obtained shelter in a neighbouring house until by Cherry's help he made his escape, and set out to Bar-le-duc to attempt the conversion of the Pretender. Many a scene of excitement, many a flush of hope, many a flutter of fear, many a pang of disappointment must have occurred under the roof of the Shottesbrook squire, as persons deep in political intrigues met for conference. Bowdler, Nelson's neighbour in Ormond Street, accompanied by his family, was a visitor to this spot ; Brokesby, a deprived clergyman of Rowley, near Hull, found in it a resting-place ; and the learned Prussian Lutheran, Dr. Grabe, who had come over to receive orders in the Episcopal Church, cultivated friendships at the agreeable mansion, convenient for him because not very far from Oxford, where treasures of learning excited his curiosity and increased his erudition. Hickes delighted in his company, and after his death compared him to a great and mighty prince, who, dying, leaves behind many plans of noble and curious buildings, some half, some almost, and others entirely finished.\* In the same place, resided Henry Dodwell, who, whilst living with Mr. Cherry, had a remarkable pupil in Thomas Hearne, patronized by the generous host, and prepared at his expense for the University, as if he had been his own son. Hearne, as we are informed on his own authority, was instructed “in the true principles of the Church of England”—an expression we can easily understand ; and we learn from the same source how busily the incipient archæologist engaged at Shottesbrook in studies and work

\* Nelson's “Life of Bull.”

subsidiary to literary schemes carried on by the eminent Nonjurors there congregated together.\*

Within a few miles of Frome, in Somersetshire, stands Longleat House, a palatial abode, surrounded by gardens, in the midst of a wooded park, worthy of the beauty and magnificence of the mansion. Just outside the park paling rises the old church of Horningsham, and hard by is a little Dissenting meeting-house, the most ancient in our island. The place is not above twenty miles from Wells, and part of the domain comes within the diocese. There the most eminent and the most admirable of Nonjurors, Thomas Ken, took up his abode, at the request of Lord Weymouth, the possessor of Longleat; and if social gatherings like those of Shottesbrook did not occur there, the residence of the Prelate rendered it a source of the purest Nonjuring influence. He occupied a room at the top of the house, removed from the noise and bustle of an English hall, "open to all comers of fashion and quality." Surrounded by his large library, "he wrote hymns, and sang them to his viol, and prayed, and died."† The most popular of all his sacred lays—the Morning and Evening Hymns—were composed on the top of a hill, which, from the prospect it commands through a break in the woods, is well known throughout the neighbourhood by the beautiful name of "the Gate of Heaven." Whether he attended the services at the parish church is matter of controversy. One of his biographers thinks that up to the accession of Queen Anne he enjoyed, in Lord Weymouth's private chapel, "the privilege of pure services, without alloy of

\* "Life of Hearne," p. 3 in "Lives of Eminent Antiquaries," Vol. I.

† "Life of Ken," by a Layman, 398.

the State prayers ;” but it is added, “ During his visits to his nephew at Poulshot, or when he was in other places where he could not find any Nonjuring assembly, we may conclude, from what he himself says, that, rather than be debarred the solace of Christian communion, he went to church.”\* At all events, Ken was distressed at the idea of perpetuating schism, he had no sympathy with the spirit of Hickes, though he allowed excuses for clandestine consecration, he declared his own judgment to be against them, and though his scruples compelled him to retire from his bishopric, he longed earnestly for the reunion of the Church.

White, Bishop of Peterborough, died in 1698, and in the month of November, 1700, was followed into the invisible world by his episcopal brother, Turner, who was “in very needy circumstances,” says Bishop Nicholson, “having a large family, and no support out of the common bank of charity.” He lived in extreme retirement, and was buried in the chancel of Therfield Church, Hertford, where he had once been rector.

Some Jacobites who took the oaths with certain qualifications repented afterwards, and openly threw in their lot with such as refused to swear. One of them drew up a penitential confession, in which, with morbid conscientiousness, he dwelt upon what he called his sinful compliance.

Another did what was still more astonishing : he publicly retracted his oath, and preached upon the words—“I have sinned greatly in that I have done ; and now, I beseech Thee, O Lord, take away the iniquity of Thy servant, for I have done very foolishly ;” and at the same time he exhorted his congregation to

\* “Life of Ken,” by a Layman, 414.

renew their allegiance to James, for whom, as the King of England, he publicly prayed. No wonder the man got into trouble. Being tried for his offence, he was sentenced to stand in the pillory and to pay a fine of £200; but the Government treated him as a lunatic, and offered a pardon if he would confess his fault. This he declined to do; consequently he remained in confinement.

The political views of the Nonjurors were narrow in the extreme, and though to be irreligious was a thing they dreaded most of all, their views of the State were of a very irreligious kind. To them it appeared as an instrument in the hands of the Church, to be controlled for its use, to afford revenues for its support, to supply means for the enforcement of its laws. The civil power, according to their theory, has been described as "a body constituted, it would seem, of three principal elements—an absolute king, money-bags, and a hangman."\* It must be said, to the credit of the Nonjurors, that however slavishly loyal to an absolute king, they showed an indifference to the "money-bags," and a contempt for the "hangman," a fact worthy of imitation by some who entertain a different theory from them. To the Nonjurors, and all men of that stamp who clung to the notion of the divine right of kings, may be applied the remark: "The great crises in the history of nations have often been met by a sort of feminine positiveness and a more obstinate reassertion of principles which have lost their hold upon a nation. The fixed ideas of a reactionary politician may be compared to madness. He grows more and more convinced of the truth of his notions as he becomes more isolated, and would rather await the inevitable

\* Maurice's "Kingdom of Christ," III. 105.

than in any degree yield to circumstances." \* The Nonjuring movement took a narrow and troublesome political form, yet, notwithstanding all we have said, it was animated by an intensely religious spirit. The scheme tended to the political enslavement of the country, it sapped the liberties of our constitution, yet it appears to have been a prejudiced and ignorant, still an honest endeavour, to serve God: one of a multitude of instances in which false opinions have perverted true sentiments, and good motives have given sincerity and disinterestedness to bad actions. No philosophy of history, but one so wretchedly narrow as to forfeit all title to the name, will deny the co-existence of right and wrong in the same men, however hard it may be to untie the knot between them.

Gladly would the Nonjurors have wrought out a method of parochial discipline which would have kept in order not merely such religionists as agreed in their views, but the population at large, reducing everybody to a Procrustean bed of belief and practice. No Presbyterians under the Commonwealth could have been more rigorous apostles of uniformity than the Nonjurors would have proved, had they but obtained permission to do as they pleased. They would have gone beyond their predecessors; for though Milton says presbyter is priest writ large, a mere presbyter has not the same element of despotic force at his command as is possessed by the genuine priest. The priest, as a steward of mystical sacraments, becomes more potent than preacher or pastor. The Nonjurors were priests, not with limitations, like some of their episcopalian brethren, but out and out. Their ministers

\* Jowett's "Dialogues of Plato," II. Introduction, 150. I have changed the word "statesman" for "politician."

offered sacrifice upon an altar, they did not merely commemorate one at the Lord's-table.

As to modes of worship, the Nonjurors were in circumstances which precluded ritualistic magnificence. They were proscribed, as Nonconformist confessors had been, and therefore were forced to serve God in obscurity. Cathedrals and churches were closed against them—they were driven into barns and garrets. Pomp, such as is now so fashionable, was to them an impossibility; not that I find them manifesting any cravings in that direction. They did not follow Archbishop Laud. High sacramental views are by no means necessarily connected with Ritualism. Ritualism may be purely aesthetical, and quite separate from peculiar doctrinal opinions; at the same time a belief in the Real Presence and in the Sacrifice of the Lord's Supper may wear an outward form not more artistic than that which obtains in a Dissenting meeting-house.

The Nonjuring party declined after the death of William III. When Frampton and Lloyd were gone, the way opened for Dodwell to do what he had long contemplated, and upon his reconciliation with the establishment, others followed his example. The death of Ken is the most interesting episode in the history of the Nonjurors during the early part of the eighteenth century. His days at Longleat are amongst the treasured memories of one of England's fairest spots; and his last journeys derive a tender pathos from the singular fact of his carrying his shroud in his portmanteau,—he remarking that it "might be as soon wanted as any other of his habiliments." He put it on himself some days before the last; and in holy quietness and peace, his death was as beautiful as his life. Not less beautiful was his burial. He was buried, by his own

request, at Frome Selwood—"the nearest parish within his own diocese" to the place where he died, "in the churchyard under the east window of the chancel, *just at sun rising*, without any manner of pomp or ceremony, besides that of the order for burial in the Liturgy of the Church of England; on the 21st day of March, 1710, anno ætat. 73."\* Burial at night was the fashion of that age, how much more appropriate was the funeral of this eminent Christian in the early morning!

\* Hawkins' "Life of Ken," 44.

## CHAPTER XII.

THE last ten years of the seventeenth century witnessed the consolidation of Dissent. Growing in confidence, Dissenters made bolder ventures. If some old congregations melted away in villages, where an ejected clergyman had worn out his days, or where the original supporters had died without bequeathing their opinions, together with their property, new congregations were formed in towns, where population gave scope for activity, and social freedom aided religious effort. Preachers with a roving commission settled down into local pastors, and a spirit of enterprise appeared in building places of worship.

As to the erection of religious edifices in London, it may be mentioned that about the era of the Revolution one was erected in Zoar Street, another in Gravel Lane, and a third in Hare Court.\* The building in Hare Court bore the name of "The Stated Room," and stood on a piece of ground of which John Strudwick, Bunyan's friend, was a trustee. The Church assembling there was of the Congregational order, founded by George Cockayne, an ejected clergyman. He was a great friend of Sir Bulstrode Whitelocke, whose house, Chilton Lodge, in Wiltshire, was licensed for Congre-

\* Wilson's "Hist. of Dissenting Churches," IV. 188, 192, III. 277.

gational worship in 1672. Sir Robert Tichborne, one of King Charles' judges, John Ireton, brother to Cromwell's son-in-law of that name, and other Commonwealth celebrities had communicated at the Lord's Supper under Cockayne's ministry. Cockayne died just about the time of building the Stated Room, in 1692. Cockayne was succeeded by John Nesbitt, a great controversialist, for whose use the meeting-house, and with it a minister's manse, was raised,—and it is worth notice that he is the person who, under the name of Nisby, figures in a paper written by Addison in the *Spectator* (No. 317) as a satire on Journals full of “inconsiderable actions.” The Church meeting in Hare Court is perpetuated in a large and flourishing congregation now worshipping at Canonbury, where the handsome sacramental plate, presented by White-locke and others, and often touched by the hands and lips of distinguished Commonwealth's-men, is still used at the Lord's Supper.\*

The neglected Halls of City Companies had become available for Dissenting worship, and by economical alterations were transformed into houses of prayer. Turner's Hall fell into the hands of the General Baptists about the year 1688; soon afterwards the Presbyterians erected “a large substantial brick building of a square form, with four deep galleries, and capable of seating a considerable congregation.”† Such edifices arose in Fair Street, Southwark; in Meeting-house Court, Blackfriars; in the Old Barbican, beyond Aldersgate; and over the King's Weigh-House, Little Eastcheap. At the end of the century, the Presbyterians provided a moderate-sized wooden building with one gallery in

\* “The Story of Hare Court,” 160.

† At Salters' Hall. (Wilson, II. 1.)

King John's Court, in the parish of St. Mary Magdalen, Bermondsey. About the same period, the Independents provided a place of worship in Rosemary Lane, and soon afterwards a large and substantial edifice was built by Presbyterians in the Old Jewry, Aldgate. It is remarkable that, after the Act of Toleration had been passed some years, liberty seemed of so precarious a nature that to enjoy it concealment was necessary. Private houses, therefore, were in this case erected between the meeting-house and the street, that the former might be screened from public view.\*

Nonconformists in the provinces imitated Nonconformists in London. Bath, then at the head of English watering-places, though still a city much occupied by clothiers, had a congregation which before had been wont to meet in "a shear-shop," but now dared to come into open day, and to build in Frog Lane, afterwards New Bond Street. In the pleasant neighbourhood of Shepton Mallet, people who had assembled in the green woods now erected chapels in the town and adjacent villages. The Warminster people raised a meeting-house at the cost of £487 2s. 7d., the sum being obtained partly by subscription and partly by the sale of pews and seats, which became the property of the purchasers, and were accordingly sold and bequeathed.†

Turning to midland counties, we find that at Nottingham, where Nonconformists had met in rock cellars such as honeycombed the sand formation, and are now formed into a cemetery, Presbyterians registered rooms in Bridlesmith Gate, and the Independ-

\* Wilson's "History of Dissenting Churches," II. 1.

† Murch's "History of Churches in West of England," 139, 157, 89.

dents sought shelter in Postern Place. A few months after William's accession, the former set to work upon a meeting-house in the High Pavement, and the latter cautiously attempted a smaller edifice at Castlegate. Little leaden windows admitted light through diamond panes, two pillars sprang from the floor to support the ceiling, stairs rising within led up to a small front gallery, a sounding-board covered the pulpit, and square pews, with other accommodation, provided for about 450 people.

At Chester a new edifice was opened in August, 1700, when Matthew Henry preached from a text indicating an apologetic spirit for what was thought a daring enterprise : "The Lord God of Gods, the Lord God of Gods, He knoweth, and Israel He shall know, if it be in rebellion, or if it be in transgression against the Lord, that we have built us an altar."

Places of worship were put in trust. Presbyterians drew up their deeds in general terms, not enumerating articles of faith or referring to any ecclesiastical standard. In many cases, Congregational edifices were secured in a similar way, some schedule being annexed to the deed, declaring that the structure should be used by such Protestants in the neighbourhood as could not conform to the established religion. Whatever might be the policy ruling the arrangement, the selection of ministers, and the character of their preaching, in numerous cases still easily ascertained, betrayed no indifference as to what is esteemed orthodoxy of sentiment. The Presbyterians formed the largest, and, in point of social position, the most respectable branch of English Nonconformists in the reign of William. What most indicated their persistency and hope is discovered in their numerous

ordinations. Down to the time of the Revolution they had been privately conducted. Just as the Prince of Orange was being driven back to his native shores by untoward storms, a young man named Joseph Hussey, who had been preaching for eight years, sought the rite from the hands of Dr. Annesley and other Presbyterians. Not in the meeting-house of Little St. Helen's did the parties dare to assemble, but at the Doctor's "private dwelling in Spitalfields, in an upper chamber." There, on the 24th of October, 1688, the candidate, as he himself reports, was examined "in the parts of learning by the Elder, who took the chair and spoke in Latin." The next day he defended a thesis against the Papacy. Upon the 26th he was ordained. The proceedings were begun and finished within the same chamber, in a neighbourhood then losing the last vestiges of rural life under the encroachments of weavers, driven from France by the revocation of the Edict of Nantes.\* As another instance of the privacy of Nonconformist services, I would mention that the Lord's Supper was not publicly celebrated in the new chapel in Leeds until the month of October, 1692.†

\* The certificate, drawn up and signed on the occasion, is worth preserving: "We, whose names are under written, do testify concerning Mr. Joseph Hussey, that upon our personal knowledge he is an ordained minister of the Gospel, whose natural parts, acquired learning, and soundness in the faith, holiness of life, and all ministerial abilities are so considerable that we groundedly hope for God's blessing upon his ministry, both for the conversion and edification of souls wherever God shall employ him." Upon this testimonial there are signs of the furtiveness in which the business had been accomplished. Five signed their names; "Domino Anonymo" is the signature of the sixth, with this appendage: "He was shie because of the cloudiness of the times, and would neither subscribe nor be known to me." (MS. by Wilson, Dr. Williams' Library.)

† Thoresby's "Diary," I. 229.

Ordinations emerged from private habitations when, in September, 1689, five ministers were ordained by Oliver Heywood and four of his brethren. There were strange incidents connected with the service, but another occurred in 1690, with accompaniments more unseemly. The service took place at Rathmel in Yorkshire, and Oliver Heywood and other Presbyterians came to share in the solemnity with two Independent ministers. Strange as it appears, those who thus met had not agreed what should be done ; and one of the Independents, as Heywood reports, urged objections which the Presbyterians undertook to answer. Both the Independents were desired to pray, but they refused, "and sat by the whole day taking no part in the proceedings." The service, however, was decorously enough conducted by the Presbyterians, who, touching the heads of the candidates, offered prayer, and after presenting a Bible, gave the right hand of fellowship. Heywood preached to the candidates and to the people, and the whole ended with singing and prayer. If anybody had wished to prejudice orderly people against Nonconformity, he could not have followed a more effectual method than we find pursued by Independents on this occasion.

As ministers could not continue by reason of death, it became necessary to reinforce the ranks. One young man of honourable descent made his appearance in public life at this juncture. Edmund Calamy, grandson of the Divine of the same name who had been Incumbent of Aldermanbury, after studying in Holland, where he had accumulated stores of Dutch theology, returned to his native land, and went down to Oxford, where he devoted himself to the study of the question, whether he should enter the Church, or continue his

lot with Dissenters? Certainly if anybody ever gave himself to the investigation of the subject, young Edmund did—for, first, he studied the Bible, then he read several of the Fathers, with all sorts of critical helps, then he perused Pearson, on the Ignatian Epistles, as well as Monsieur Daillé and Larroque on the other side, then he betook himself to the examination of Chillingworth's “Religion of Protestants,” which he carefully epitomized, then he attacked Hooker's “Ecclesiastical Polity,” and went through it book by book, setting down the arguments with such remarks as they suggested, then he turned to Jeremy Taylor's “Ductor Dubitantum,” dealing with this as he had done with the rest, and, lastly, with care he read over the Articles, Liturgy, Homilies, and Canons of the Church of England.\* Such an amount of reading for the settlement of opinion was very well for a youth of twenty-one, and, making allowance for a bias derived from family traditions and from the ugly memories of 1662, we must credit him with candour in looking at the subject on all sides. According to his own account, his reading was chiefly in favour of Episcopacy; yet his conclusion was decidedly in favour of Nonconformity. The Nonconformity which he adopted, however, was moderate; it shrunk neither from Episcopal orders, Liturgical worship, nor the Establishment principle, but from certain things enforced by the Church of England. He tells us himself that he would have received ordination at the hands of a Bishop, “could he have found any one that would not have demanded a subscription and engagement to conformity, and a subjection to the present ecclesiastical government.”†

\* Calamy's “Life,” I. 224-264.

† “Defence of Moderate Nonconformity,” Part I. 213.

It is remarkable to find how much Calamy engaged in preaching when he had made up his mind upon ecclesiastical points. He occupied pulpits wherever they were open. He seems to have been welcomed everywhere, now officiating at the opening of a meeting-house and once at least preaching in a parish church.\* He had conflicting invitations. He describes a visit to Andover, where the meeting-house was in a back yard, through which he had to pass, the people making a lane for him and presenting their acknowledgments for his good sermon ; and how he found the parlour full of men, women, and children, amongst them was a grave old woman with a high-crowned hat, who thanked him civilly for his pains, telling him she thought a special Providence had sent such a shepherd to such neglected sheep. The conversation, however, as it went on proved less and less satisfactory, since it turned out that these Andover folks were divided into parties, the old lady's Calvinistic sentiments being loftier even than her steeple headgear.† Calamy travelled down to Bristol, the great Nonconformist stronghold in the west, to preach to a congregation of 1500 people, and was met at Bath by a couple of gentlemen, "with a man and horse," to conduct him to his destination. Upon the road others came to welcome the stranger, like the brethren who met Paul at Appii-Forum, and brought him on his way "in a manner very respectful." Many of the congregation were wealthy, and they offered him £100 a year and a house to live in, as assistant to their infirm pastor. But, upon returning to London, Calamy decided on accepting an invitation to assist Mr. Sylvester upon an

\* "Life of Calamy," I. 301.

† Ibid., 304-309.

allowance of £40 per annum.\* He had there the counterbalancing advantage of mixing in the best Nonconformist society. He spent many an evening at the house of Dr. Upton, in Warwick Court, where he met his colleague and Mr. Lorimer, Mr. John Shower, Mr. Nathaniel Taylor, Mr. Thomas Kentish, Mr. Nathaniel Oldfield—names now little known, but celebrities in their own day. Other ministerial meetings were kept up in Dr. Annesley's vestry, Little St. Helen's, where once a month Latin disputations took place. Whilst thus engaged, Calamy remained unordained. Desirous of this rite, he successively requested Howe and Bates to take part in it. But no public ordination had yet been held within the city precincts. Howe at first seemed pleased with the proposal, but afterwards demurred, saying he must wait upon Lord Somers, and inquire whether such a proceeding would not be taken ill at Court. Bates decidedly declined, and continued to do so for reasons he would not communicate. Matthew Mead was indirectly asked, but begged to be excused, because, as an Independent, he feared he might offend some of his brethren by joining in a Presbyterian ordination. The whole of the transaction is enveloped in mystery; perhaps Bates had not given up all hopes of a comprehension, and thought a public ordination might bar the way to it, perhaps he had given some pledge not to engage in any such service, perhaps Howe was not quite free from similar determents, and both might for personal reasons be unwilling to do what they had no objection should be done by others. My own impression is that both, especially Howe, clung with tenacity to the idea of one united church in England, and though they had

\* "Life of Calamy," I. 313-318.

little hope of seeing the idea turned into fact, they shrank from a service like public ordination as perpetuating a separation they would fain have seen come to an end. At length Calamy and six others were publicly set apart to the ministry, at Dr. Annesley's meeting-house by the Doctor himself, Vincent Alsop, of Princes Street, Westminster, Daniel Williams, pastor at Hand Alley, Bishopsgate Street, Richard Stretton, of Haberdashers' Hall, Matthew Sylvester, of Carter Lane, and Thomas Kentish of the Weigh-House. Annesley began with prayer, Alsop preached, Williams, after another prayer, delivered a second sermon, then he read the testimonials in favour of the candidates; next each of them delivered a profession of faith, and then, one after another, different ministers prayed; Sylvester followed with a charge, and concluded with a psalm and a prayer.\* The service lasted from before ten o'clock until past six.

As vacancies in Nonconformist pastorates occurred, successors had to be appointed; and it is amusing to meet in the Diaries of the day, cross lights thrown upon the choice of ministers. The famous antiquarian Thoresby was in 1693 a leading member of the old Dissenting Church at Leeds. When deprived of its excellent instructor, Mr. Sharp, "we had several meetings to consult in order to the choice of a successor. I had the usual hap of moderators, to displease both the extremes. In the interim I wrote to several ministers to supply his place. We rode to Ovenden, and made our first application to Mr. Priestley, a person of moderate principles, learned, ingenious, and pious; but the people about Halifax and Horton could not be prevailed upon to resign their interest in him, without

\* "Life of Calamy," I. 348-350, June 22, 1694.

which he was not willing to desert them. I afterwards rode with some of the people to Pontefract, to solicit Mr. Manlove, who was at first very compliant, yet after relapsed, but in the conclusion accepted the call and removed to Leeds.”\*

The education of boys, and the theological training of those designed for the ministry, were matters of great anxiety during the reigns of Charles II. and James II., and afterwards received increasing attention. Seminaries for Dissenters did not in the seventeenth century attain the dignified title of colleges. They were schools where youths were educated for secular vocations, and only by degrees did they become the resort of candidates for the ministry. There was no trust-deed, no constituency, no council, but the entire management rested with the person responsible for opening the institution. In the romantic district of Craven, Richard Frankland, a learned ejected minister, received pupils, but the Five-Mile Act drove him to Attercliffe. First and last he educated three hundred youths for the professions of law and of medicine, and for the work of the Christian ministry.

Archbishop Sharpe was requested by some of the Clergy to prevent Frankland from proceeding in his labours. He consulted Tillotson as to the best method of procedure, and received from him this reply: “His instructing young men in so public a manner in University learning is contrary to his oath to do, if he hath taken a degree in either of our Universities, and I doubt, contrary to the Bishop’s oath to grant him a licence for doing it; so that your Grace does not, in this matter, consider him at all as a Dissenter. This I only offer to your Grace as what seems to me the

\* Thoresby, I. 246.

fairest and softest way of ridding your hands of this business." To explain this advice, it is proper to remark, that in the Middle Ages, factions arose at Oxford and Cambridge, and hosts of students, under some favourite professors, would march off to Northampton or Stamford to set up rival schools and grant degrees. Hence an oath came to be required of the University graduates, that in no other places than in the favoured retreats on the Isis and the Cam would they ever establish a scholastic lecture. It was in harmony with Tillotson's characteristic wariness to give such counsel, but it is hardly worthy of his reputation for gentleness and Catholicity to put the disconcerted Prelate up to the trick of masking the batteries of intolerance under the specious cover of obsolete precedents. It should be added, that Archbishop Sharpe behaved very courteously to Frankland throughout this unpleasant business;\* and also that other Dissenting tutors in different ways were hindered by the opposition of Churchmen. Two other academies sprung out of Richard Frankland's, one at Attercliffe under the superintendence of Timothy Jollie, another at Manchester under the care of John Chorlton. In the old town of Shrewsbury, Francis Tallents established a seminary about the time of the Revolution; and there is a considerable list of Nonconformist schoolmasters between the ejectment and the end of the century.

The Metropolis drew towards it several learned men in this capacity, and Newington Green became "the favourite seat of the Dissenting Muses." There the learned Theophilus Gale, and the less known but erudite and able Charles Morton, educated a number of young men. Edward Veal had a school at Stepney,

\* See correspondence in "Thoresby," III. 177.

and Samuel Wesley, after having been a pupil of Veal's, became a student under Morton. Violent opposition to the Established Church is said to have been fostered under Veal's roof, and this young man, who possessed a lively poetical talent, answered invectives against Dissent by invectives against the Church, until, from some cause which has been differently explained, he abandoned Nonconformity, and one August morning in 1683, with forty-five shillings in his pocket, walked all the way to Oxford, and entered himself as a servitor of Exeter College. Samuel Wesley, in a letter published in the year 1703, reflected upon the Dissenting academies, and afterwards defended what he said in a reply to Mr. Palmer. Palmer vindicated the academies from the charge brought against them; but, by a curious coincidence, he like Wesley gave up all connection with Dissent, and obtained the living of Maldon, in Essex. Thomas Doolittle, of Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, and Thomas Vincent, of Christ Church, Oxford, united in conducting, until within a short time before his death in 1708, an academy at Islington. During Matthew Henry's stay at Islington he pursued a course of reading which bore upon the Christian ministry, but when he left that place he studied law for a time at Gray's Inn, although it does not appear that he ever thought of entering the legal profession. The fact is, that the elder educated Nonconformists of that day valued all kinds of learning, and were anxious that their children, especially if designed for the ministry, should traverse the widest curriculum of study. Further, it may be mentioned that Ralph Button, fellow and tutor of Merton, Oxford, who died in 1680, conducted another academy at Islington.

Dissenting academies could not resemble national

Universities. A variety of professors, extensive libraries, aristocratic society were beyond their reach, and polite literature and the graces of composition were but little cultivated.

Youths of all sorts were admitted into these academies, as into modern boarding-schools ; hence some pupils might be of doubtful character. Also prejudices against the Church of England would naturally arise. Amongst the elder pupils the controversies of other days would be revived, and enthusiastic spirits would tilt a lance on the side of “the good old cause.” Charles I. and Charles II. would be no favourites ; James II.’s Popery would be denounced ; Cromwell would be excused and praised ; and William III. lauded to the skies. In the common room where students unbent, there might be fun and laughter ; in the private study there might be other volumes than classical and theological text-books ; levity and idleness probably existed in these gatherings of great boys and young men ; and damaging charges, no doubt, could be substantiated against some of them ; but the character of these maligned institutions must, after all, be judged by their courses of study, by the character of their professors, and by their educational results. These tests being applied, lead to a favourable conclusion. The studies combined logic, metaphysics, and ethics, with readings in Colbert, Le Clerc, Suarez, More, Cicero, and Epictetus ; natural and political philosophy, with the use of Aristotle, Descartes, and Vossius ; and the perusal of Latin and Greek historians and poets. Candidates for the pastoral office read Divinity, and studied the Greek Testament with such critical helps as were afforded in those times. We are assured that in lectures the Church of England was treated

with respect, the Predestinarian controversy was discussed with moderation, and Monarchical maxims of government were upheld. What the most distinguished teachers were, and what many of the pupils became, may be seen in preceding and following pages.

I must not conclude this account without stating that as these academies were interrupted by intolerant laws, common schools also were subject to the same inconvenience. Cunning methods were sometimes adopted by schoolmasters, or were alleged to be so, with the view of overcoming clerical opposition,\* and occasion was given for the display of an unseemly spirit even by Bishops otherwise exemplary; bad mutual relations consequently in many quarters existed between Churchmen and Nonconformists.

During the Civil Wars, heart-burnings existed between Presbyterians and Independents. They continued under the Protectorate, they diminished after the Restoration, and it might have been hoped would then have died out for ever; unhappily they revived when the Revolution had set both parties at liberty.

An effort at union was, however, made in 1690, under the form of articles agreed to by the Dissenting ministers. They were published, under the title of "*Heads of Agreement*, assented to by the united ministers in and about London, formerly called Presbyterian and Congregational." The Presbyterians and Independents, who after the Revolution adopted these Articles, could not have held exactly the same views as did Presbyterians and Independents before the Restoration. The former must now have abandoned all notions of parish presbyteries and provincial synods, and must have approximated to the Congre-

\* "Cole MSS., British Museum, XXX. 148.

gational idea of what used to be called “gathered churches.” Reference is made to parochial bounds as not being of divine right, yet for common edification, the members of a particular church, it is said, ought, as far as convenient, to live near each other. A great deal was conceded by Presbyterians, when they allowed that each church has a right to choose its own officers, and that no officers of any one church shall exercise any power over any other church.\* The Independents also must have passed through a change, inasmuch as they now ceased to insist upon the duty of church members entering into formal covenants, and allowed that, in the administration of church power, it belongs to the pastor and elders to *rule* and *govern*, and to the brotherhood to *consent*, according to the rule of the Gospel. They also tacitly admitted that a man might be ordained to the work of the ministry without having a specific pastoral charge, and that the pastors or bishops of neighbouring churches should concur in the ordination of a new pastor or bishop over a particular congregation.

In the chapter relative to the communion of churches, the Independents of the Revolution showed more disposition towards unity than their predecessors had done, and the chapter indicates an approach to Presbyterian government.† Seeds of concord between the two denominations bore some fruit in the provinces. An association combining them grew up in Devon and Cornwall, and Flavel preached and presided at its first meeting. In Hampshire and Norfolk the plan met with favour. So it did in Nottinghamshire, and in the neighbourhood of Manchester, where, however, Independents were few. It was warmly taken up in

\* “Heads of Agreement.”

† Ibid.

the West Riding of Yorkshire, and it seems that the townspeople at Wakefield were alarmed at the influx of ministers walking through their streets, yet these reverend gentlemen did not amount in number to more than twenty-four, and "when the service at Mrs. Kirby's" was over, "they thought it prudent to go apart, and by several ways, to the house at which they dined."\*

A violent controversy, which, before its close, ran through both Calvinistic and Socinian questions, and gathered up personal entanglements, started into life soon after the Act of Toleration had been passed. The doctrines of Justification, the Atonement, and Christ's Divinity came successively within its range. Combatant after combatant entered the field, and although the antagonists, for the most part, were Nonconformists, they managed, before they had done, to involve one or two distinguished Churchmen within the coils of their dispute. The scene of the first stage was the little town of Rowell, in Northamptonshire, where a devoted Puritan, named John Beverley, had created a considerable sensation in the days of the Commonwealth, and out of this a church had sprung. After the Revolution, Richard Davis, from the Principality, became minister; and as an indication of his narrow and jealous independence, it is mentioned that he was "installed in the office of pastor or bishop" by the church itself, and by that church alone, some pastors of other congregations, who had come "to behold their faith and order," withdrawing from the assembly, because there was nothing for them to do. Brooking no restraint, he made the whole county of Northampton his diocese, and went

\* Thoresby's "Diary," I. 210. Hunter's "Life of Heywood," 374.

from place to place preaching and gathering converts into his fold. He enflamed others with ardour like his own, and became the centre of a wide circle of lay agency. People living at a great distance were brought into fellowship with the band at Rowell, and they would, lantern in hand, trudge twenty miles along dirty roads on winter mornings to hear him preach, and in the same way go back at night. Offshoots from this vigorous community became in time distinct societies. These proceedings soon excited jealousy, and the jealous were not slow to accuse the lay agents of ignorance, and their superintendent of great imprudence,\* tidings of which reached London, and attracted the attention of respectable Presbyterian ministers. What was worse, heresy, as reported, mingled with wildfire, and Davis stood charged with maintaining that believers always appear before God without sin. Oddly enough, this Antinomian preacher is said to have entertained an idea that baptism in the parish church is invalid, for this, amongst other reasons, that the administrators are not of Christ's sending. Davis defended himself as best he could, and the church of which he was pastor vindicated his character, denying some ridiculous stories, yet speaking of his ministry in terms corroborative of its high Calvinistic type.

The second stage of this controversy appears in London. The Calvinism of the Commonwealth had by no means perished. Old books bearing its impress, old preachers repeating its echoes, still remained, and where sympathies with it continued to thrive, of course the Northamptonshire pastor found advocates.

\* Extracts from the Church-Book in "Memorials," by T. Coleman.

Just at this moment an insignificant incident fanned the flame. A son of the noted Dr. Tobias Crisp reprinted his father's works, with additions from unpublished papers; and very artfully, the editor procured the names of some well-known Divines, simply, as he said, to attest the genuineness of the MSS., a thing perfectly superfluous; really, as he must have meant to promote the sale of the new edition. Crisp was a Predestinarian of the first water, and maintained the doctrine of Election and the limitation of the Atonement in the narrowest and most repulsive form. The excitement produced by this book, in connection with the disturbance created by Davis, was wonderful. The advocates of High Calvinism hailed it as the commencement of a millennium; they talked and preached and wrote with renewed vigour, and those who opposed them were denounced as legalists. On both sides bitterness increased. The more Crisp's book was condemned, the more it was read. Its circulation was greatest amongst the uneducated, who praised the author up to the skies. The editor informs us that, in so unlikely a place as Guildhall, at one of the livery meetings, he was accosted by a citizen, who wrung him by the hand, and, with tears in his eyes, thanked him for reprinting his father's sermons. Daniel Williams, a Presbyterian minister, formerly of Dublin, and at the time of the Revolution presiding over a numerous congregation at Hand Alley, in Bishopsgate Street, was then rising into eminence; and being a moderate Calvinist, he determined to oppose the circulation of Crisp's work. Consequently, in 1692, he published his "*Gospel Truth Vindicated*," and prefixed to it is a list of approving theologians, including Bates, Howe, Alsop, and Lorimer.

This publication led to unpleasant complications, and to understand them we must refer to the celebrated lectures delivered in Pinners' Hall. Lectures in the heart of the Metropolis had been popular when Puritanism was at its zenith. When Indulgence came, Pinners' Hall happened to be vacant, and being conveniently situated in Broad Street, it was hired for a Wednesday morning exercise. Four Presbyterians and two Independents undertook to officiate in succession. From the beginning, however, unfortunate bickerings appeared, and at the Revolution dogmatic differences became increasingly manifest. The circumstances of this Lecture perhaps had something to do with the way in which the Northamptonshire quarrel was taken up, certainly it added fuel to the fire kindled by the republication of Crisp's works. In 1692, of the old Pinners' Hall lecturers only Bates remained, his new colleagues being Williams and Alsop. The other new lecturers were Mead and Cole, decidedly Independent, and John Howe, who, although previously reckoned amongst Independents, seems by this time to have associated chiefly with Presbyterians, and to have had more sympathy in their temper than in that manifested by some of his active Independent brethren. Attempts at union entirely failed. Storms of feeling could not be allayed by verbal incantation, and a contemporary, who narrowly watched the proceedings, deplored the absence of a healing spirit.\*

But I must hasten to the third stage of this intricate dispute, when, in 1695, Stephen Lobb, "the Jacobite Independent," charged Williams with implicitly denying the communion of persons between Christ and believers, because he had denied such a relation as

\* Calamy's "Life," I. 327.

Crisp maintained, who went so far as to declare Christ to be by imputation as sinful as man, and the believer to become through faith as righteous as Christ. This led to explanations too wearisome for notice. If any one will take the trouble to look into what Williams wrote, he will be astonished to find a man, who went so far in his notions of the union between the Mediator and His people, suspected of not believing in the Atonement; and he will discover a signal instance of the intolerable demands which some will make upon others, in order to extract from them a full amount of prescribed orthodoxy.

The battle raged hotter and hotter. Williams was even accused of Socinianism, and not content with robbing him of all claim to orthodoxy, his exasperated opponents tried to filch from him his virtuous reputation. But he kept them at bay, and at last completely overcame them.\* Towards the end, two distinguished Churchmen came upon the stage, Dr. Jonathan Edwards, Principal of Jesus College, Oxford, and Bishop Stillingfleet, both of whom were appealed to by the disputants as to the doctrine of Commutation, and the charge of Socinianism brought against Williams. The Bishop, of course, contradicted Crisp's absurd notion, and pronounced Williams innocent of heterodoxy. It is said that the number of Antinomians amongst Nonconformists diminished after the close of the controversy.

Dissenters cannot be charged with an absorbing attachment to their distinctive system; they valued

\* This account is drawn up from Williams' collected pieces in two volumes, "Crispianism Unmasked," Crisp's "Christ made Sin"; pamphlets by Lorimer, Calamy's "Abridgment," "Life of Bull," and Toulmin's "Hist. of Dissent."

more the common truths of Christianity, but they were prepared to vindicate their own ecclesiastical views and to repel aspersions. David Clarkson, who had before published books on Episcopacy, in answer to Stillingfleet, sent forth in 1689 his discourse on Liturgies. The charge of being schismatical, laid at the doors of Nonconformists, led Matthew Henry to publish in the same year a "Discourse concerning the Nature of Schism," in which he endeavoured to prove, that there may be schism where there is no separation, and that there may be separation where there is no schism. The discourse being attacked, William Tong, in the year 1693, came forward in its defence, maintaining that the want of charity, not the want of particular ministerial orders, creates sinful schism ; and that to charge the crime upon such Dissenters as cultivate candour, liberality, and love, is "a piece of diabolism which the Gospel abhors, and of which humanity itself will be ashamed." He complained at the end, "that non-resistance and passive obedience was the universal cry in the Church, and squeezed till the blood came : but the mischief was, when they had nursed the prerogative, till it had stung some of them and hissed at all the rest, they presently let the world see they never brewed this doctrine for their own drinking."

But Nonconformist polemics were not confined to the maintenance of a common cause ; they took an internecine turn, not only in connection with the Crisp affair, but in connection with occasional conformity. By the Corporation Act, every one holding a municipal office was required to receive the Lord's Supper in the Church of England. Sir John Shorter, a Presbyterian, had by such conformity qualified himself to act as

Lord Mayor of the city of London in the reign of James II., and two distinguished Dissenters in the following reign occupied the same civic post and adopted the same policy. Sir Humphrey Edwin was Lord Mayor in 1697, and, dressed in a gown of crimson velvet, carried the city sword before William, as, on his return from the Continent, he passed through London with the customary pomp of a public procession. He not only conformed at certain times during his mayoralty, but he also, on one occasion when he attended Divine Service at Pinners' Hall Meeting-house, caused the civic paraphernalia to be carried before him. I am not aware whether any other Lord Mayor did this. Sir Humphrey Edwin might be said to bring the State over to Nonconformity, as at other times, when he knelt at the altars of the Establishment, he brought Nonconformity over to the State. At all events, his conduct subjected him to annoying criticism. He was attacked by a clergyman who preached before the Corporation in St. Paul's Cathedral. Ballads and lampoons caricaturing what he had done were hawked about the streets, and Swift, in his "Tale of the Tub," satirized Sir Humphrey in his well-known reference to Jack's tatters coming into fashion, and his getting upon a great horse and eating custard. Tragical exclamations were uttered in High Church circles, and in a publication of later date it is declared, that "to the great reproach of the laws, and of the city magistracy," the Mayor "carried the sword with him to a nasty conventicle, that was kept in one of the City Halls, which horrid crime one of his own party defended by giving this arrogant reason for it, that by the Act of Parliament by which they have their liberty, their religion was as much established as

ours.” \* The Lord Mayor’s proceeding did not meet with the approbation of his co-religionists. They felt the injustice of the attacks which it had occasioned ; it seemed to them inconsistent and arrogant for Churchmen to speak in the way they did of a religion which had the same object of worship, the same rule of faith and life, and the same end and aim as their own ; yet they saw that Sir Humphrey’s conduct had been such as naturally to lead to misapprehension and to produce annoyance. Calamy lamented that “this measure drew unhappy consequences after it, both in this reign and in that which succeeded.” †

Sir Thomas Abney, a Presbyterian, became Lord Mayor of London in the year 1701. Prior to that date he had favoured occasional Conformity. When in office he attended church. This occasioned a controversy between two Nonconformists, who regarded the conduct of Abney and Edwin from different points of view. Daniel De Foe—who had written about half a dozen clever pamphlets in about fifteen years, and was on the point of commencing that career as an author which made him so notorious among contemporaries, so popular with posterity—published anonymously, in 1697, an “Enquiry into the Occasional Conformity of Dissenters.” In his own trenchant style, with vigorous Anglo-Saxon idioms, employed after a rasping fashion, he declared that none but Protestants halt between God and Baal ; none but Christians of an amphibious nature could believe one way, and worship another.

In the year of Abney’s mayoralty, De Foe republished his “Enquiry,” and prefixed to it a preface addressed to John Howe. John Howe was Sir

\* Nichols’ “Apparat. ad Defens. Eccl. Ang.”

† “Hist. Account of my Own Life,” I. 401.

Thomas's pastor, and De Foe demanded that he should declare to the world, whether the practice of alternate communion was allowed either by his congregation, or by Dissenters in general. Howe being dragged before the public, referred to his own moderate views in points of difference between Conformists and Nonconformists, but denied having advised Sir Thomas as to his conduct ; he declined to enter upon the question, and only contended that occasional Conformity to one communion, if a fault, should not exclude a person from habitual fellowship with another. De Foe had taken up occasional Conformity as a qualification for holding office, and had shown that so regarded it is incapable of vindication ; but Howe regarded the question from another point of view, and proved that a person who, apart from worldly motives, communes with one church on particular occasions, and with another church on common occasions, does nothing which impeaches his conscientiousness or destroys his consistency.

De Foe attempted to vindicate himself, at the same time animadverting upon Howe's want of zeal. The latter having reluctantly taken part in this business, could not be induced to say another word. The spirit of Howe stands out in contrast with the narrowness of his opponent, and nothing but one-sided partisanship could induce any man to charge the advocate of occasional communion with disloyalty to Nonconformist principles.

The Independent mode of conducting worship resembled the Presbyterian. Baptism and the Lord's Supper were observed by both much in the same way. The latter was celebrated in most places once a month ; in some, once in six weeks.

Ecclesiastical revenues in both denominations of course were voluntary. The expense of educating men for the ministry was met by parents or friends ; assistance in some cases being provided out of charitable funds. The Fund Board was established soon after the Revolution, and from its proceeds young candidates received grants. To this fund the Presbyterians contributed £2,000, and the Independents nearly £1,700, a year. Assistance also proceeded from an endowment under the will of a Mr. Trotman, who, after the Act of Uniformity, bequeathed property for Nonconformist purposes. The trustees were ejected ministers, almost all of them belonging to the Independent denomination ; and they afforded small exhibitions to persons studying for the ministry. Amongst distinguished beneficiaries were Stephen Lobb, who entered Trinity College, Oxford, in 1679 ; Benjamin Chandler, who studied at the same University ; Samuel Wesley, who, for a while, as we have seen, contemplated being a Dissenting pastor ; William Payne, of Saffron Walden, a friend of John Owen ; and the celebrated divine and poet, Isaac Watts, the last of whom received aid from the Fund Board also. The support of Dissenting pastors depended mainly upon their flocks. Sometimes, as we have seen, money was raised for the erection of meeting-houses by the sale of pews, which became the property of the purchasers ; but in such cases, as well as others, the salary of the minister principally arose from the subscriptions of the people. Endowments in certain cases increased the revenues, but sometimes, where churches had no such resources and needed sustentation, grants were made from the Fund Board.

It is worth while to advert to Nonconformists' Sun-

days at home. In many a farmhouse and city dwelling, the master called his household round him in the evening, to read a chapter and to ask religious questions,—all being catechised, from the old servant by the door to the child who sat by the cosy hearth, within the folds of mamma's ornamented apron. Perhaps a discourse was read, a psalm sung, and a prayer offered. The young folks might have looked sleepy before all was over, and some of the older ones might with difficulty have kept their eyes open; but there were men and women who could say at the end of these Puritan Sabbaths, with the Henry family at Broad Oak: "If this be not heaven, it is the way to it." The relation of the pastor to his flock was intimate. He was their guide and counsellor. Families grew up calling him their own friend and their father's friend; for the pastoral bond was rarely broken in those days, except by death or some very remarkable circumstance.

Of the character of the early Nonconformists, testimony is borne by Dr. Watts, who loved to cherish memories of the old Dissent, as he had seen it in his young days. No doubt we sometimes deceive ourselves in looking down the vista of the past. A transparent haze mellows the whole; perhaps fancy takes liberties with the details, and lays on tints of her own. How more than halcyon were the times of the Confessor from the distance of the reign of Rufus; yet there was truth in the Saxon's estimate, under a Norman dynasty, of a former generation. Unquestionably, there is truth in Watts' review. He refers mainly to a period rather earlier than that embraced within this chapter, yet the light of Puritanism's autumn day did not expire so long as Baxter and Howe survived;

Watts mentions the reverence of Dissenters for the name of God, of their strict observance of the Sabbath, of their habits of religious conversation, of their regular discharge of religious duties, of their nonconformity to the world, and of their economical expenditure.

But all was not sunshine in the old Dissent. Indeed, Watts lamented the changes he witnessed. So did Howe ; his lamentations being deepened by the loss of early friends, "so many great lights withdrawn, both such as were within the National Church Constitution, and such as were without it." And, no doubt, in connection with altered circumstances and the advance of free ecclesiastical opinion, there came a considerable decline of spiritual fervour. The strain and tension of earlier religious life almost ceased. As in the Church of England there was more calmness and moderation in Tillotson, Tenison, and Burnet, for example, than in Cosin and Ward, so it was with Dissenters, as appears when we compare such a man as Matthew Henry with such a man as Richard Baxter, or when we place Edmund Calamy by the side of his grandfather.\*

\* The information given on p. 304 is derived from documents to which I have access as one of the trustees of Trotman's property.

## CHAPTER XIII.

ONE by one in the reign of our third William the fathers of the old Dissent passed away. They just saw the morning of religious liberty, they just touched the border of the land of promise, they dwelt under its vines and fig-trees for a little while, and then died in peace.

Philip Henry expired in the summer of 1696. A few candidates for the ministry, who had in private academies gone through what they termed a University course, were permitted to reside at Broad Oak, and to listen to the instructions of its master. "You come to me," he would say, "as Naaman did to Elisha, expecting that I should do this and the other thing for you, and, alas! I can but say as he did: 'Go wash in Jordan.' Go study the Scriptures. I profess to teach no other learning but Scripture learning." Philip Henry reminds us of John Bunyan's pilgrims in the land of Beulah, as we read the following passage, written not long before his death: "Methinks it is strange that it should be your lot and mine to abide so long on earth by the stuff, when so many of our friends are dividing the spoil above, but God will have it so; and to be willing to live in obedience to His holy will is as true an act of grace, as to be willing to

die when He calls, especially when life is labour and sorrow. But when it is labour and joy, service to His name, and some measure of success and comfort in serving Him, when it is to stop a gap and stem a tide, it is to be rejoiced in—it is heaven upon earth." The shadow of death in mid-winter enveloped another scarcely less famous Puritan home. Samuel Annesley, an older man than Philip Henry by twelve years, with a ministerial history which ran far back into the troubles of the Commonwealth and Civil Wars, continued to preach in Little St. Helen's to a congregation of wealthy citizens, amongst whom might be seen Daniel De Foe, sometimes the eccentric John Dunton, and at an earlier time the almost equally eccentric Samuel Wesley, the two latter being married to two of Annesley's daughters. Annesley retained great influence amongst the Presbyterians, having "the care of all the churches on his mind, and being a great support of Dissenting ministers and of the Morning Lecture." He entered his pulpit for the last time, saying, "I must work while it is day," and died with ecstatic exclamations on his lips: "I have no doubt nor shadow of doubt—all is clear between God and my soul. He chains up Satan; he cannot trouble me. Come, dear Jesus! the nearer the more precious, and the more welcome. What manner of love is this to a poor worm! I cannot express a thousandth part of what praise is due to Thee! We know what we do when we aim at praising God for His mercies! It is but little I can give, but, Lord, help me to give Thee my all. I will die praising Thee, and rejoice that there are others that can praise Thee better. I shall be satisfied with Thy likeness! satisfied! satisfied! Oh, my dearest Jesus, I come!" The old register of St. Leonard's, Shoreditch, for

December, 1696, has this entry : "Samuel Annesley was buried the seventh day, from Spittle Yard."\*

Nathaniel Vincent, when the Revolution brought him rest from spies, informers, and constables, quietly went on with his work in St. Thomas's, Southwark, amidst the Presbyterian congregation which he had gathered ; but an unhappy division before his death gave him trouble, sixty members breaking off to join another church ; but no blame attached to him for this. If the eulogium pronounced by his friends be true, "he scarcely entered into any company, but he was like a box of precious ointment, and left some sweet perfume from his heavenly discourse." Vincent's end was sudden and premature ; he had only leisure to exclaim : "I find I am dying. Lord ! Lord ! Lord ! have mercy on my family and my congregation." His age was but fifty-three.† Dr. William Bates, a close friend of Archbishop Tillotson, retained his popularity and his renown for "silver-tongued" eloquence beyond the Revolution of 1688. As one of the preachers at Salters' Hall after the establishment of the New Lecture there in 1694, although an old man of seventy-four, he preached to a thronged assembly ; but he lived in the village of Hackney, where he ministered to a Presbyterian congregation in Mare Street.‡ Howe's estimate of Bates' character has been quoted in a former volume ; it is sufficient here to add the following words by the same writer : "God took him, even kissed away his soul, as hath been said of those great favourites of heaven, did let him die without being sick, vouchsafed him that great privilege—which a good man would

\* Williams' "Life of Annesley," and Kirk's "Mother of the Wesleys."

† Toulmin, 522.

‡ Palmer, I. 103.

choose before many—not to outlive serviceableness. To live till one be weary of the world, not till the world be weary of him—thus he prayed wisely, thus God answered graciously.”\* He died in July, 1699.

John Howe survived his friend about five years. It appears from his allusion to “the great lights of the National Church,” how his affections lingered around those who were its ornaments, and passages occurring in his answer to De Foe, indicate Howe’s increasing tenderness towards the Church of England in his last days. He had always been a moderate Dissenter, but his moderation assumes broader dimensions than ever in that publication—the effect, I apprehend, partly of natural tendencies and partly of unpleasant circumstances. He had, from the very constitution of his mind, what many great and good men have not—a burning thirst for union, for a large fellowship of souls on earth preparatory to the final gathering of the purified and perfected. This passion increased in Howe, the nearer he approached the world of light and love. He longed, as his days ebbed away, to embrace within his fellowship the good and wise of all parties; consequently lines of distinction between church and church, between sect and sect, became in his eyes paler and paler. And I cannot help seeing that the disputes amongst Nonconformist ministers in London—the unhappy divisions arising out of the Crisp controversy—vexed him exceedingly, and loosened a little the bonds which had bound him to the Independent body. A moderate Congregationalist in earlier life, he appears latterly to have sympathized most with Presbyterians.

\* Howe’s “Works,” Vol. VI. 306.

Oliver Heywood’s death occurred in May, 1702. No particular account of it is given by Mr. Hunter in his biography.

The church in Silver Street, of which he took the pastoral charge, was Presbyterian. The Salters' Hall Lecture, with which he identified himself, was Presbyterian. Presbyterians were less opposed to the Established Church than were Independents, the latter felt no wish for comprehension, the former did ; and in that wish, which the impossibility of its gratification could not quench, John Howe deeply shared to the very last.

In his latter days he largely experienced the joys of religion. He seemed at that period to attain a more ethereal purity of soul, a more sublime elevation of mind, and a more seraphic glow of devotion. The ancients believed that the nearer men approach the hour of death the more divine they become, and the more piercing is their insight into the mysteries of futurity. Howe, under the influence of a divine enthusiasm, certainly appeared during the last year of his life as if the veil of flesh had been parted, and his free spirit had found a pathway which "the vulture's eye hath never seen." It is related that on one occasion at the Lord's table, his soul was suffused with such rapture that the communicants thought his physical strength would have sunk under the weight of his preternatural emotions. And another instance of overpowering delight about the same time, is recorded by himself in a Latin note found on the blank leaf of his study Bible. After notice of a peculiarly beautiful and refreshing dream which he had some years before, he adds : "But what of the same kind I sensibly felt through the admirable bounty of my God, and the most pleasant comforting influence of the Holy Spirit, on October 22nd, 1704, far surpassed the most expressive words my thoughts can suggest. I then experienced an inexpressibly pleasant melting of heart,

tears gushing out of mine eyes for joy that God should shed abroad His love abundantly through the hearts of men, and that for this very purpose mine own should be so signally possessed of, and by, His blessed Spirit." One trembles at criticising such a phenomenon, and at attempting to resolve it all into a delirium of excitement. Who that has ever mused on the nature of the human mind, on the mystery of that unseen world which presses close around it, on the piety of such a man as Howe, and on the special love which God bears to those whom He makes so like Himself, would dare to speak lightly of such an incident?

Friends conversed with him to the last, and the visit of one of them deserves special notice. Richard Cromwell called upon him in his last illness, but the words they interchanged have died away, save an indistinct echo lingering in a brief sentence by Calamy : "There was a great deal of serious discourse between them ; tears were freely shed on both sides, and the parting was very solemn, as I have been informed by one that was present on the occasion."\* As a proof that Howe needed patience of an unusual kind, I may mention that he said to his wife : "Though he thought he loved her as well as it was fit for one creature to love another ; yet if it were put to his choice whether to die that moment, or to live that night, and the living that night would secure the continuance of his life for seven years to come, he would choose to die that moment." In the same spirit he remarked to an attendant one morning, after being relieved from the intense sufferings of the previous night : "He was for *feeling* that he was alive, though most willing to die, and lay the 'clog of mortality aside.'" When his son, a physician, was

\* Rogers' "Life of Howe," 357, 316.

lancing his leg to diminish his sufferings, Howe inquired what he was doing, and observed : " I am not afraid of dying, but I am afraid of pain." Indeed he had a peculiar sensitiveness with regard to physical agony, which seems to have been constitutional. All but joy soon afterwards terminated, for, on the 2nd of April, 1705, his spirit entered those regions of repose which he had long so fervently desired to reach.

The passing away of the old Puritans could not but produce a great effect. When the last of the Apostles left the world, those who remained in the line of succession, so far as Apostles could have any proper successors, would fail to reach the level of experience, character, and influence which their predecessors occupied. And when the last of the Protestant Reformers died, there would be a falling off in the ardour and force which marked the religious leaders of the next generation. And so, without equalizing Apostles, Reformers, and Puritans, we may say of the last, that when they were all gone, though their cause remained in the hands of men who had learned their lessons, the fire no longer burned with the glowing heat it had done before. There might be more breadth of view, there might be advancement in some respects, but there remained not the same force which had operated so mightily at an earlier period. Puritanism, as a creed, as a discipline, as a form of worship, as a religious sentiment, remained ; but much of its original inspiration passed away.

Another circumstance may be noticed. The Puritans of the Commonwealth had in early life mingled socially with Anglicans. They had sat on the same forms at school, had lived under the same college roof, had preached in the same places of worship. Owen,

Baxter, and Howe had all shared more or less with Churchmen in the same modes of life before the severance of 1662. Those who followed them were for the most part wholly separated from the Establishment, from its universities, its pulpits, its society, its courtesies, its atmosphere. Hence arose a personal estrangement between two great parties, in some respects more mischievous in its results than any of the controversies previously waged. There have been influences at work in Society which rarely arrest the attention of historians, because hidden in the obscure depths of common life; and yet they have had a potency of effect, beyond even some prominent events which come out as landmarks in the past. I am inclined to ascribe to the social separation of Churchmen from Nonconformists, which opened in the middle of the seventeenth century, and gaped so wide at the close—much of that mutual suspicion, and that tendency to attribute bad motives to those of a different opinion, which still prevent, more or less, a candid and charitable consideration of each others' arguments. Friendly intercourse is a moral discipline which affects our intellectual nature, and, by softening the asperities of temper, prepares a man to meet his fellow man with less of that prejudice so common to all, which blinds one person to phases of truth discerned by another.

The Baptists multiplied after the Revolution, and continued, often obscure, but always staunch supporters of independence and voluntaryism. In this respect they differed from Presbyterians, and often went beyond Independents. The representatives of more than one hundred churches met in London in the year 1689, and continued in conference a few days. They

republished a Calvinistic confession of faith, adopted in the year 1677, but their business in the main was with practical matters and the religious improvement of their denomination. They took a gloomy view of spiritual affairs, and, although looking at them from a very different point of view, reached conclusions resembling those of the Nonjurors. In furtherance of their objects they appointed a general fast, and directed that the causes and reasons of it should be explained. They projected a sustentation fund, in aid of churches, ministers, and students; at the same time they pronounced it expedient for small churches, in the same neighbourhood, to unite together for the support of the ministry. They ventured to commence an attack on the long periwigs of men, especially ministers, and the bravery, haughtiness, and pride of women, who walked "with stretched-out necks and wanton eyes, mincing as they went." They deplored worldly conformity, and though they did not deny that ornaments were allowable, they said every ornament which opens the mouths of the ungodly ought to be cast off. Baptists had been reproached as Trimmers under James II. for the sake of their own liberty; but the representatives on this occasion declared that, to their knowledge, not one congregation had ever countenanced a power in the King to dispense with penal tests, and that William III. was a Divine instrument for the deliverance of England.\*

A second assembly of the same nature met in London upon the 2nd of June, 1691, and another on the 3rd of May, 1692. They proposed to divide their annual assembly into two, one for the east in London, and the other for the west in Bristol, and they

\* Crossby's "Hist. of Baptists," III. 246-258.

enjoined the making of quarterly collections for objects specified, at the same time expressly repudiating all idea of exercising synodical control. Musical harmony had been a cause of discord ; some of the Baptist celebrities, including Kiffin and Keach, had plunged into disputes on the subject, and it was alleged that facts had been misrepresented and unwarrantable reflections published to the world. The matter came under the notice of a committee, which appears to have given an impartial decision. They declared that both parties were in the wrong ; that, granting some statements might be true, they had laid open one another's errors in an unbecoming spirit ; that they ought to remember how Ham, for discovering the nakedness of Noah, was accursed of God, and how failings were forbidden to be told in Gath and Gilgal. They recommended that all the publications produced by the dispute should be called in and disposed of by the Assembly ; and they finished their award by entreating, as upon their knees, that the brethren would keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace.\*

Kiffin and Keach were amongst the Baptist magnates at the end of the Revolution, and were far more influential than Bunyan. Of Kiffin I have had occasion to speak. It only remains to add, that he continued his ministry to old age, and that his latter days were adorned by an act of beneficence. After the French Protestants had been driven from their own land, he took under his protection and entirely supported a family of rank, nor would he when these refugees recovered a portion of their fortune, accept any return for past services. He died in 1701, leaving a reputation for piety, consistency, and theological knowledge, and

\* Crossby, III. 259, 264-270.

also for moderation, together with firmness in the maintenance of Calvinistic and strict communion views. Of Benjamin Keach I have also spoken. Although a good man, and of an ingenious turn, he must have been rather pugnacious, for his works are of a controversial stamp, relating to the seventh-day Sabbath and the question of psalmody. He was one of those who have not the smallest doubt of being themselves right, and of everybody else being wrong. Adult Baptism he described as "Gold Refined;" the Athenian Society he attacked for what it had said respecting Pædobaptism; he rectified a Rector by proving Infant Baptism unlawful in his "Axe Laid to the Root," or one blow more aimed at that practice, which one blow would beat down for ever the arguments of Mr. Flavel, Mr. Rothwell, and Mr. Exell; finally, by "A Counter Antidote," he strove to resist the assaults upon what his antagonists would call Anabaptism. His congregation is spoken of as the first to sing in public worship. So cautious were they, because of the prejudices of their brethren, that they went on step by step, for a long time restricting the practice to the close of the Lord's Supper, then venturing upon a hymn amidst the exultation of a thanksgiving-day, and at last, after a struggle of fourteen years, becoming so bold and yet so temperate, as to sing every Sunday, after objectors to the practice had been allowed to retire.\*

The distinction between Particular and General Baptists assumed sharper form and greater prominence after the Revolution.

Matthew Caffin was a celebrated man amongst the latter. Five times he suffered imprisonment for his Nonconformity, besides which he was repeatedly fined

\* Crossby, IV. 298-301.

under the Conventicle Act. Opposed to the doctrine of Calvinism, like the rest of his brethren, he also distinguished himself by opposition to the Athanasian Creed. He objected to its definition and to its damnable clauses, although he did not adopt either Socinian or Arian tenets. Caffin appears to have been one-sided, with a repugnance to all assumption on the part of the Church, and with a dislike of what are called dogmas, he did not sufficiently consider the importance of principles as resting-places for faith and as sources of religious inspirations. In his horror of ultra-Calvinism, he forgot that dangers may arise from other points of the horizon. Not foreseeing the consequences of his course, not intending to open the door of heresy, he, through lack of sufficient positiveness, became the forerunner of those lax opinions which afterwards injured churches of the General Baptist order.

Turning to the Quakers, we find them placidly thankful for toleration, yet vexed by demands for tithes and church-rates, sufferings of which records were drawn up and sometimes printed and circulated. When they approached the Throne, both the King and the Lord-Keeper treated them with respect, and gave them assurances of friendship. Parliament listened to their expostulations, but of course the laws of the country rendered it impossible that they should be exempted from the payments in question any more than other people. Enabled by the substitution of affirmations for oaths, the members of their community submitted to the use of an anti-Socinian test; but the continued requirement of oaths in various relations exposed them to much hardship, for as they would not swear in legal exigencies, they were often defrauded

of their rights. The policy of the Revolution opposed this condition of things, and in 1695 the complaints of Quakers and the efforts of their friends secured a beneficial change: affirmations were substituted for oaths in civil as well as ecclesiastical concerns. Fox and Barclay remained leaders, visiting societies and promoting the spread of their principles. Identifying their own cause with the cause of humanity, regarding themselves as charged with a pacific mission to the world, they continued to serve their generation in the spirit of the angel's song: "On earth peace, good-will toward men."

Friends continued to maintain their self-government. The poor were taken care of; widows and orphans were provided for; local meetings were held by each congregation for the supervision of affairs every week, fortnight, or month, according to numbers; quarterly meetings were held in every county; and a general yearly meeting was held in London in Whitsun-week, "not," it is cautiously said, "for any superstitious observation the Quakers have for that more than any other time, but because that season of the year best suits the general accommodation."\* In the genial spring, therefore, the Friends met in the days of King William. Nonconformity to the world in point of dress was an important article of practice, and sorely were the spirits of the Elders vexed by the tendency of younger members. The question was discussed: Friends were warned against the fashions of the world, and were forbidden not only to wear but to sell any garments of vanity. Earnest exhortations were de-

\* Sewell, II. 370, 448. The early meeting has been since fixed for the month of May.

livered touching religious education and simplicity of speech.

The series of struggles depicted in this History present something of an Epic interest; for during the Civil Wars there was strife for *Ascendency*, which ended in the triumph of Puritanism, and in the treatment of Anglicans, somewhat after a wretched fashion which had been set in former days. After the Restoration, the resentment of Anglicans came once more into play, and severe persecutions followed; yet efforts at *Comprehension* were made by healing spirits on both sides without effect. At the Revolution, as I have largely shown, experiments with a view to reunion were attempted with no better result, but a great and most beneficial change was accomplished by the legalizing of freedom in religious thought and ecclesiastical action. The shield of the constitution was extended over previously persecuted Englishmen, and the age of *Toleration*, as it is termed, then began. Local interferences with the liberty of worship continued to occur, but they were contrary to law. The reign of William III. was the beginning of a new era in English History, and its ecclesiastical consequences can be ascertained only through a study of the religious movements of the eighteenth century.

## CHAPTER XIV.

ANNE succeeded her brother-in-law, on Sunday, the 8th of March, 1702. Bishop Burnet attended William's death-bed, in Kensington Palace, and, together with Archbishop Tenison, administered to him the Holy Communion. After watching through a long night the ebbing sands of the Sovereign's life, he joined in the last commendatory prayer ; and then, at the moment of his master's decease, hastened with the tidings to St. James' Palace. There resided the heiress to the crown ; and at her feet he " prostrated himself, full of joy and duty," as he announced her accession. The message must have been more acceptable than the messenger ; for her ecclesiastical, as well as her political sentiments, were by no means in accordance with those of the Whig Bishop.

Born in 1665, daughter of the Duke of York, afterwards James II., and his first wife, Anne Hyde, she had not been educated in the Roman Catholic faith, to which both her parents were attached,—the protestant feeling of the country prevented that ; but her mind early became imbued with Anglo-Catholic feeling. As a girl she conceived a warm attachment to the Church of England, and as she rose into life she resisted the attempts of those who endeavoured to bring her over to the Church of Rome. The regularity

with which she monthly received the Lord's Supper, according to Anglican rites, has been especially noticed ; and her whole life proved her zealous devotion to the Creeds, the Articles, and the formularies of the Established Church. She married George, Prince of Denmark, in 1683, and his influence as a Lutheran, whilst it would not tend to diminish her reverence for Episcopacy,—since Lutheran superintendents in that country, are essentially Bishops,—certainly would not serve to lower any High views she might hold of the nature and efficacy of the two sacraments.

The inferiority of her intellectual powers, her narrow sympathies, and her prejudiced opinions, have been too often exposed to be ever forgotten ; but her domestic affections were strong and pure. As a wife and mother, no stain has ever touched her character ; and the loss of child after child was a trial she sorely felt. Everybody is acquainted with the story of her intimate friendship with the Duchess of Marlborough, and in many of its details it shows not only the feebleness of her understanding, but the warmth of her heart ; not only her submission to another's will, but her earnest craving for another's sympathy.

The influence of "queen Sarah" over Queen Anne no doubt was immense, but it was in political more than in religious matters. Her diligence in attending on religious worship in general, and her reverential behaviour in the House of God, were the more noticeable in an age when such habits, at least amongst the upper classes, were far from being so common as they are now. Dean Swift describes the Duchess as a "lady not without some degree of wit, which she shows by the usual mode of the times, in arguing

against religion, and endeavouring to prove the doctrines of Christianity impossible." If that description be at all true, the stronger mind did not so control the weaker, as to impart any corresponding scepticism ; and, from what will appear hereafter, the Queen's friend did not, to any great extent, influence her in the distribution of Church patronage. That patronage, it may be observed, after having been entrusted by William to a commission, was, immediately after his decease, taken by Anne into her own hands.

Three days after her accession she met the Houses of Parliament. Most favourable was the impression she made by her speech to the Lords and Commons. The Royal lady earned the title of "good Queen Anne" mainly by her pleasant manners, whereas William, with all his wisdom, and liberality as a constitutional Monarch, left, by his reserved behaviour, an unfavourable impression on the minds of his people. Amongst the multitude who approached the throne, were the Presbyterian, Independent, and Baptist ministers of London. No reply, such as had been given by former sovereigns on similar occasions, appears to have been afforded to this address ; and the Royal silence was construed as an ungracious reception, out of harmony with the courtesies eulogized by Burnet. In her speech from the throne, at the prorogation of William's Parliament in May, Anne declared : "I shall be very careful to preserve and maintain the Act of Toleration, and to set the minds of all my people at quiet ; my own principles must always keep me entirely firm to the interest and religion of the Church of England, and will incline me to countenance those who have the truest zeal to support it." The second clause modified

the first, and left no doubt as to the objects of Royal favouritism.

Soon after the Queen came to the throne, she ostentatiously revived a custom which, by the zealous defenders of the Divine right of Royalty, was reverenced as a proof, no less than an assertion, of the legitimacy of her title. The Royal touch had of old been regarded as efficacious, and the later Stuarts, according to an elaborate formulary, had been used on a large scale to comply with the request of their subjects for the exercise of this curious prerogative. William the Third had wisely discouraged the superstition, because, as the Jacobites said, not being a true successor to the throne he did not possess the Divine gift ; but Anne, being a Stuart, was believed to inherit it, though how that could be, when on Jacobite principles her brother, the Pretender, was entitled to the crown, is not apparent. At all events, "touching for the evil" became again a popular ceremony. Multitudes came, if not to be healed, still to see Her Majesty, and to receive her silver token ; and every one is familiar with the anecdote of Dr. Johnson, who used to speak of his being touched, saying, "he had a confused, but somehow a solemn recollection of a lady in diamonds and a long black hood." Encouraged by the flattery of courtiers, she from time to time went through the absurd ceremonial. The newspapers proclaimed what she did, and so increased the number of applicants. Twenty persons are mentioned as having been touched at St. James's, just before Christmas Day.

Anne's coronation took place on St. George's Day, the 23rd of April. Two regnant Queens of England had been crowned long years before. Mary the First, according to the Romanist ceremonial ; Elizabeth,

according to a ceremonial partly Romanist and partly Reformed. In both instances the rites were maimed. No Primate placed the crown on the Royal brow. The two Archbishops were in prison when Mary was crowned. Canterbury was vacant, and the Archbishop of York would not use any part of the English Liturgy, in the case of Elizabeth. The second Mary, too, together with her husband, had to be content with the offices of the Bishop of London, Archbishop Sancroft refusing to officiate. Anne was the first Queen regnant to enjoy the services of the Primate of All England, and in this instance, both Archbishops took part in the solemnity. One place only was vacant, that of the Bishop of Bath and Wells ; Ken having been superseded by Kidder, and Kidder being at the time in disgrace. Now, for the first time, was used the full Protestant Service at the coronation of a Queen crowned alone. Archbishop Tenison uttered the words of recognition, presenting Anne as Queen. Then came the English shout, in a clear ringing tone, "God save Queen Anne!" after which the trumpets sounded, and then followed the Litany. Next the Communion Service was read, as far as the Nicene Creed ; then came the sermon, preached by Sharp, Archbishop of York, and pronounced by Bishop Burnet, "good and wise." The Coronation Oath was administered, and immediately the great Bible, which had been carried in the procession, was brought from the altar, by the Archbishop of Canterbury to the Queen, who solemnly kissed it. After the anointing, the choir sang the "*Veni Creator Spiritus*," and after another prayer, the Coronation Anthem followed. The ermine mantle removed, the Queen sitting in St. Edward's chair, the rite of anointing, with other signi-

fificant ceremonies, ensued ; and after another burst of “God save the Queen,” a Benediction was pronounced, and the Te Deum sung. The enthronization took place afterwards, together with the homage of the Peers ; and after another shout had rung through the arches of the old Abbey, the remainder of the Communion Service was completed.

The next public occasion on which we meet Her Majesty, in connection with the Church, is at Oxford, at that time the High Church seminary of learning. She was conducted in state by the Vice-Chancellor, Doctors, and Masters, all in their robes, to her lodgings in Christ Church, and was next day escorted to the Convocation House, where she witnessed the conferring of Degrees ; afterwards, according to custom, she accepted the present of “a Bible, a Common Prayer Book, and a pair of gloves.”

After visiting Oxford she went to Bath. “Her Majesty was met at Hyde Park, within half a mile of the city, by a handsome company of the citizens, all clad like grenadiers, and above two hundred virgins richly attired ; many of them like Amazons with bows and arrows, and others with gilt sceptres and other ensigns of the Regalia in their hands ; all of them with a set of dancers who danced by the sides of Her Majesty’s coach. All the streets were illuminated, and a great number of flambeaux were carried.”\* At Bristol also there were great rejoicings. Queen Anne appears on a more distinctly religious occasion, when we find her in the new cathedral of St. Paul’s, on the 12th of November, returning thanks for the Earl of Marlborough’s successes in the Low Countries. There we see her on the throne, “exactly as in the House of

\* Stanhope’s “Queen Anne,” I. 70.

Lords," on a platform covered with a Persian carpet,— "an armed chair, with a fald-stool before it, and a desk for the Queen's book, covered with crimson velvet richly embroidered and fringed with gold, with a cushion thereon of the same." These descriptive words occur in the Royal Proclamation of the service, and they indicate the supremacy which Her Majesty claimed in the Church, as well as the supremacy which she exercised in the State. Both Houses of Parliament, the Lord Mayor and Corporation of London, the Foreign Ministers, the Bishop of the Diocese, the Dean and the Prebendaries were all present in their appropriate places,—the whole symbolical of the union, established by law, between the temporal and spiritual powers of the realm. A sermon was preached by the Bishop of Exeter, who took for his text the 9th verse of the 23rd chapter of Joshua: "But as for you, no man hath been able to stand before you unto this day." And the discourse was said to be "excellent." At a later period, 1704, Her Majesty visited St. Paul's to celebrate the victory of Blenheim, with like ceremony and like significance. And again she went, in 1705, after the forcing of the French lines by the hero of Blenheim; once more the ceremony occurred, in 1706, after the battle of Ramilie; and in 1707 there was a loyal thanksgiving for signal successes achieved by the English army. In 1713 thanks were returned for the peace of Utrecht, by both Houses, in St. Paul's Cathedral, when Her Majesty preferred to offer her devotions privately in her own palace.

Previous to the service in St. Paul's at the close of the year 1702, the Queen appeared at the opening of her new Parliament, when she made the following remark bearing on the religion of the country: "I am

resolved to defend and maintain the Church as by law established, and to protect you in the full enjoyment of your rights and liberties, so I rely upon your care of me ; my interests and yours are inseparable, and my endeavours shall never be wanting to make you all safe and happy." Before this it became apparent what policy, in Church as well as in State, found favour with the new Sovereign. Whigs were in office when William died—many were allowed to remain at their posts—but very soon decided Tories rose to a participation in office, and distinctly indicated the new current in the administration of affairs. Other unmistakable circumstances proved that a change had come.

There was "a spirit in the air" which it is proper at once distinctly to notice. The Low Church party had been in the ascendant at the Revolution, and continued to be so, more or less, through the reign of William III. The High Church party had been depressed. It cannot be said that the two parties changed places on the accession of Queen Anne. "Low Church" retained bishoprics and benefices as before, "High Church" could not at once be lifted to chief seats in the national synagogue ; but a spirit of the latter kind experienced signal encouragement and a marked revival after the decease of William ; at the same time tendencies of the former description sustained a decided check, and underwent, in many quarters, a gradual decline. Dissenters were soon made to feel the change which had occurred. The Act of Toleration was far from commanding universal sympathy. A large number looked upon it with dislike, and a larger still regarded it with suspicion. It found no favour in the eyes of Nonjurors, and High Churchmen ; and

some who had been, not very cordially, on its side from their connection with the Whigs, now on political grounds became tired of the connection ; therefore they were ready to snap the only tie which bound them to ecclesiastical liberalism. Hence there were not wanting elements to produce a reactionary policy in the treatment of Dissenters. The first manifestation of the new unpopularity of Dissent is indicated by Calamy, when he tells us that violent Churchmen in several parts of the country talked of pulling down meeting-houses, and at Newcastle-under-Lyne, actually went to work as soon as tidings of the King's death reached them.\*

That the pulpit and the press commenced a crusade against the liberties secured by the Revolution is proved by Sacheverell's sermon, entitled "The Political Union, showing the Dependence of Government on Religion in general ;" and by Leslie's pamphlet, entitled "The New Association of those called Moderate Churchmen, with the Modern Whigs and Fanaticks, to undermine and blow up the present Church and Government." The titles speak for themselves, and distinctly reveal the nature of the productions to which they are prefixed. The first asserted the supremacy of the Church, and the obligation of the State to support its authority, and bow to its behests ; the second railed against all moderation and liberality in politics ; both publications betraying the same spirit of opposition to the fundamental principles of the Revolution. Such sentiments found a wild response in the conduct of multitudes ; and both in London and the country corresponding popular demonstrations were witnessed. England, indeed human nature, loves

\* "Abridgment," 620.

to declare opinions and feelings in acts as well as words, in quaint symbols as well as spoken and printed speech. Maypoles had long been dear to English citizens and rustics, as significant emblems of loyalty, and attachment to the Church ; Puritan dislike to the cause which encircled them had rendered the innocent masts with their wreaths and ribbons instruments of defiance against all kinds of Dissent. On this account they became, after the accession of Anne, more than ever popular manifestoes with the lower classes, who industriously erected them in the city square, and on the village green, and danced round them in frantic merriment, singing songs, drinking healths, and ringing out loud huzzas in honour of Church and Queen. But there were other signs of the same thing much more important.

The new Parliament summoned by Anne, and which met on the 20th of October, contained a large Tory majority, and in reply to her speech it was said, “ After Your Majesty’s repeated assurances, we neither doubt of the full enjoyment of all our rights and liberties, nor of Your Majesty’s defending and maintaining the Church as by law established ; Your Majesty has been always a most illustrious ornament to this Church, and has been exposed to great hazards for it ; and therefore we promise ourselves, that, in Your Majesty’s reign, we shall see it perfectly restored to its due rights and privileges, and secured in the same to posterity, which is only to be done by divesting those men of the power who have shown they want not the will to destroy it.” This was striking the note of a retrograde revolution ; one that should undo what Parliament in the previous reign had done ; and it also pointed to the degradation of all Liberal statesmen, and the dis-

couragement of all Liberal Bishops. It is an instance of party feeling carried afterwards to so extravagant a pitch that it defeated its own purpose, and only reflected discredit upon its authors. Next, a complaint was made by Sir John Packington, on the 18th of November, against the staunch Whig Bishop of Worcester, Dr. Lloyd, for having interfered in the election for the county. The Bishop had actively opposed Packington's return, and had written some violent letters on the occasion. The complaint was established to the satisfaction of the House, and not without good reason ; for, judging from the Bishop's correspondence adduced on the occasion, he had clearly committed himself, and acted inconsistently with his position both as a Peer and a Prelate. By a strong resolution, the House besought the Crown to remove him from the office of Almoner, which he held ; and this was done, without hearing what might be said on the other side of the question. The Lords, seeing the injustice of proceeding against one of their number without giving him an opportunity of defence, came to the rescue, but in vain. The Queen listened to the Commons, and complied with their request. It was quite a party affair, and the member of the Lower House who brought the charge against Lloyd, betrayed not only a personal animus against one who opposed his election, but also exhibited a dislike to all the Spiritual Peers on the Liberal side, as appears from his reported speeches.

A more unequivocal proof of the state of feeling amongst the Commons remains to be noticed. A Bill was brought in, which is justly described by a candid historian as "a bold attempt to repeal the Toleration Act, and to bring back the pains and penalties of the

times before the Revolution.”\* This was the Occasional Conformity Bill. It has been attributed to two clergymen residing in the city of Coventry, Dr. Armitstead and Mr. Kimberley. Whatever its origin, an order was passed for bringing it in; and on the 14th of November it was introduced by Mr. Bromley, Mr. St. John, afterwards Lord Bolingbroke, and Mr. Annesley, afterwards Earl of Anglesey. It was immediately read for the first time; was committed on the 17th, and read a third time on the 28th; so rapidly did the stages succeed one another. The Bill provided that those who were obliged to receive the sacrament at church as a qualification, if, during their continuance in office, they were present at any conventicle where more than five people assembled should forfeit one hundred pounds, and five pounds for every day they afterwards continued in office, and should be disabled from holding it afterwards; upon a second offence of the kind they were to pay a double penalty. Upon the second reading, when it was proposed that the Committee be empowered to adopt a clause, exempting Dissenters from obligation to accept any appointment which required conformity, the proposal was rejected; a circumstance forming the most unrighteous part of the whole business, as it entailed liability to pay a fine for not serving an office to which an elected Dissenter might have a conscientious objection. If we may rely on Burnet, the argument for the Bill was,—that attending church on a single occasion for the sake of office, and going afterwards to a meeting-house, was an evasion of the law, a profanation of the sacrament, and a notorious scandal, rousing alike the indignation of strict Dissenters and of habitual Con-

\* Perry’s “Hist.” III. 145.

formists. The argument against the Bill was, that toleration had quieted the kingdom ; that Dissent had by it lost more strength than it had gained ; that the nation being engaged in war abroad, it was impolitic to raise animosities at home ; that to encourage informers was a pernicious practice ; that the fines imposed were excessive ; and that, under this Act, respectable men would suffer from unprincipled enemies. The Bill having left the House of Commons appeared in the House of Lords ; and all who pleaded for the Bill, we are told, professed not to oppose the Toleration Act, though, as Burnet adds, “the sharpness with which they treated Dissenters in all their speeches, showed as if they designed their extirpation.”

The Bill was read in the Upper House a first time on the 2nd of December, and a second time the next day. The day after that, the elders of the French and Dutch Protestant Churches prayed to be freed from the operation of the projected law, after which amendments were suggested by certain Peers. The reasonings were substantially the same as in the Lower House ; but it was added on the side of opponents, that the Bill tended to model borough corporations according to a Tory type, and so advance Tory interests ; and that to embroil society in this way, would discourage our allies and weaken our power in carrying on a war against the kingdom of France. The Bill met with opposition, on different grounds, from several temporal and spiritual Peers ; also by a manœuvring method the pecuniary fines were altered, with the idea that this would provoke the displeasure of the Commons, jealous as they were of interference with money matters on the part of the Lords. The Amendments led to a long conference

with the Commons ; and on the 16th of January, 1703, we find the Duke of Devonshire, the Earl of Peterborough, the Bishop of Salisbury, Lord Somerset, and Lord Halifax, as managers for the Lords, in conflict with Mr. Bromley, Mr. St. John, Mr. Finch, the Solicitor General, and Sir Thomas Powis, as managers for the Commons. These gentlemen, in the clerical, and lay costume of the day, with wig and cassock, or wig and coat, and all in high-heeled shoes bedecked with glittering buckles, become visible to us, through the mists of years, on that winter day ; and we find them grievously troubled at the crowd of members who filled the Painted Chamber before their arrival. The Commons complained to the Lords that they could not get near the table. The House ordered the Lord Keeper to acquaint the Lord High Chamberlain that the room must be cleared, so that the managers from the Lower House might come to the bar. Evidently the two branches of the Legislature were not in harmony. The machinery had got out of gear. Each threw the blame of confusion on the other. The Commons complained of the crowd ; the Lords told them they would do their best to make room, but said, "unless the House of Commons will send for their own members out of that place, it will be very difficult to effect it." When the chamber was cleared, and the two parties stood face to face, with the Bill before them, and a long list of amendments on the table, the contention became sharp and noisy enough ; and we can imagine the Bishop of Salisbury, riding on the wings of the storm, and meeting, amidst lightning and thunder, an equally excited opponent in the future Viscount Bolingbroke. No agreement could be reached. The Lords adhered to their amendments, the Commons adhered

to their opposition, and so the measure came to nothing.\*

Machinery worked behind the scenes. Whilst speeches were made on the floor of St. Stephen's and in the old House of Lords, and a hand-to-hand struggle proceeded in the Painted Chamber, the Cabinet was busy, the Court was busy, the Queen was busy. Marlborough and Godolphin pulled what strings they could lay their hands upon; Prince George, though a Lutheran, receiving the sacrament in the Established Church, as Lord High Admiral, and betraying his real sentiments in whispered words to a Peer on the other side,—“My heart is wid you,”†—even he, under pressure, was compelled to support the intolerant enterprise. The Queen, above all others, wished to see the measure passed, and used influence with her husband and her friends for this purpose; often talking the matter over, no doubt, as she sat with Sarah of Marlborough at the tea-table, in the oriel-windowed room of Windsor Castle, or in some snug corner of St. James' Palace.

From the Houses of Parliament we pass to the Houses of Convocation. Some of the Clergy claimed to sit after the death of William, but the lawyers decided against them; nor would Parliament pass an Act for the continuance of their session; such an Act, in the opinion of the Attorney-General, being a violation of the Royal supremacy. When the new Parliament assembled in the ancient palace of Westminster, the Upper and Lower Clergy gathered together in the

\* “Journals” and “Parliamentary History,” under date, and Burnet. II. 336.

† The story is told in connection with this occasion, but I rather think it belongs to a later date.

still more ancient Abbey. The usual formalities took place ; and Dr. Aldrich, Dean of Christ Church, was elected Prolocutor. Attired in his Doctor's gown of scarlet, he had scarcely begun to occupy the presidential chair, within the enclosure of Henry the Seventh's Chapel, when a contest commenced respecting the proposed address to the Throne. The Lower House wished to use language which reflected on the reign just closed, but such a course the Upper House resolutely opposed. At last they came to an agreement ; and the Queen, in real wisdom, though in seeming satire, replied, "that their *concurrence* in this dutiful address was a good presage of their union in other matters, which was desirable for her service and the good of the Church." \*

The old bone of contention as to the right of prorogation soon appeared ; and the Clergy requested the Bishops to reconsider matters in dispute—a request which the latter acknowledged on the 13th of November, saying that they were anxious to restore peace, and that the contested right, which they asserted to be theirs, should be ever exercised so as to promote union between the two bodies. A Committee of Prelates was appointed to meet a Committee of the Lower House, when the latter proposed that their brethren should be allowed to prepare matters of business before Convocation met. But no concessions were of any avail, short of altogether relinquishing the right of prorogation claimed by the Archbishop ; and those who demanded this surrender, proposed to address the Queen, and beseech her to appoint competent persons for the adjudication of the controversy. It was rejoined, that the spectacle of a Church at variance with itself, seeking

\* Lathbury's "Convocation," 377-8.

the help of a Privy Council, would give no small triumph to the enemies of the Establishment.

As the Clergy had so long disputed with their Diocesans, many said they acted as if they were Presbyterians, and set at nought Episcopal orders. This plausible if not well-founded accusation put them on their mettle, and at once they declared that they acknowledged *the order of Bishops as superior to Presbyters, to be of Divine Apostolical institution*, and they desired the Bishops to join with them in defining the true doctrine of Episcopacy. A cunning contrivance was this to fix their superiors between the horns of a dilemma. They sought to make them concur in High Church views of the episcopate, which would involve a renunciation of some Bishops' well-known opinions; or, by provoking a refusal, to make them appear unfaithful to the Church, and favourers of Presbyterian equality. If there appeared on one side the wisdom of the serpent, it found not on the other the simplicity of the dove. Parties were pretty equally matched, as to sagacity, acuteness, and a regard for what they deemed their own interests. In the end resistance overcame attack; and if the one side rose like a surging billow, the other stood like a steady rock. After consideration, Tenison, Burnet, and the rest, simply answered,—that as the Church had not declared the superiority of Bishops to be a Divine institution, they doubted whether they could legally assert it in Convocation without a Royal licence; whereupon the Lower House, not to be beaten in this chess-like game, retaliated, by saying, that they were now blamed for asserting too much on behalf of Episcopacy, after having been blamed for allowing too little; therefore they wished the Bishops to support

sound Episcopal doctrine, by declaring against all Erastian and Arian theories. Here came another palpable thrust at Latitudinarians and Whigs. They might have returned a blow to the effect, that the advocates of Episcopalian government in theory were rebellious against Episcopalian government in fact.

Pertinacity on the side of Prelates in maintaining a control over the proceedings of the other House, came in conflict with equal pertinacity on the side of the latter, for the Clergy proceeded to do what they had before suggested ; they petitioned Her Majesty to interfere in the dispute. They said, they had in vain requested their superiors to join in submitting the case for Royal decision, they therefore now took the matter into their own hands, and prayed that she would exercise her Royal authority for the settlement of the strife. Her Privy Council accordingly considered the question, and concluded that the existing form of prorogation, being in accordance with precedent, could not be altered but by a statute of the realm. The Crown itself gave no reply to the petitioners, leaving it to be supposed that as the Queen and the Court favoured their appeal, silence proved the non-existence of any legal ground on which High Churchmen could take their stand.

Parliament being prorogued on the 27th of February, 1703, and afterwards again and again until the 9th of November, convocational sittings were interrupted ; when the last date arrived, both the temporal and ecclesiastical powers resumed their activity. Scarcely had the House of Commons met than they returned to their former policy. A motion was made on the 25th of November to bring in a Bill against occasional conformity, but it did not meet with the same

acceptance as before. Then there had been no division ; now, against 173 yeas there were 130 noes ; the Bill itself was somewhat altered, the old preamble being omitted ; the number constituting a conventicle being enlarged from five to twelve ; and the penalty for attending it reduced from £100 to £50. We miss no lack of violence on the part of some of its supporters. Sir John Packington, the Bishop of Worcester's enemy, unconstitutionally claimed the sympathy of the Queen, and reviled everybody opposed to the Stuarts.

The second reading, before unanimous, was, on the 30th of November, opposed by 132 against 210 ; and the third reading, on the 7th of December, reckoned 140 opponents to 223 supporters. A change in the temper of the House was visible. The fact is, though the Queen still secretly wished the High Church party to succeed, Marlborough and Godolphin saw the new attempt to be impolitic, and that deep offence had been given in many quarters by the proceedings of the previous years ; also that Whig votes were needed for other Bills, and that it would not do to exasperate the Liberal leaders any further. A similar effect appeared in the House of Lords. Burnet came out in full force against the resuscitated measure, and so did other Peers, including the Duke of Devonshire, the Earl of Peterborough, Lord Mohun, and Lord Wharton.\* Of the Bishops, London, Winchester, Rochester, Chester, and St. Asaph, were among the contents ; Canterbury, Worcester, Salisbury, Ely, Lichfield, Norwich, Peterborough, Lincoln, Chichester, Oxford, and Bangor, were non-contents. Godolphin voted for it, yet confessed the time chosen to be inopportune. Marlborough

\* "Parl. History," VI. 158-166.

reluctantly gave his support, but Queen Anne, probably influenced by queen Sarah, allowed Prince George to absent himself on the occasion—an example followed by certain Tory Lords. On a final division the Bill was thrown out by 71 against 59, including proxies.

On the same cold winter days, Henry the Seventh's Chapel and the Jerusalem Chamber continued to be opposing camps, the High Church banner waving over the one, the Low Church flag over the other. Paper after paper passed between them, in fact challenges to combat, with courteous, and sometimes, as they were regarded, uncourteous replies. During a recess between the 15th of December and the 4th of February, a Committee, according to the overture of the Bishops, spent a good deal of time, amidst the cheer of their Christmas and New Year's holiday, in drawing up a document which occupies a large place in the records of Convocation. Without waiving any independent rights, they commence with a statement that the House had employed several of its members to prepare such "heads of matter, as being debated and approved, might be offered to their Lordships' grave and wise consideration." Numerous articles of complaint follow—as to the breach of divers canons and constitutions ; the irreverent reading of the Prayer Book ; the neglect of public infant baptism ; the inadequate provision for administering the Lord's Supper ; the want of decency in worship ; the irregularity of some ordinations ; abuses connected with the marriage ceremony ; the disuse of discipline ; the commutation of penance ; the permission of schools without canonical licence ; the defective presentments of churchwardens ; carelessness in keeping registers ; and inaccuracy in print-

ing the Bible.\* The Archbishop informed his brethren of the Lower House, that the Bishops should be furnished with copies of the paper; but afterwards said, that some of their complaints did not come within the limits of the canons; and Burnet, if he did not say so in the Jerusalem Chamber, wrote in the "History of his Own Time," that the Clergy, in their complaints of abuses, "took care to mention none of those greater ones, of which many among themselves were eminently guilty; such as pluralities, non-residence, the neglect of their cures, and the irregularities in the lives of the Clergy, which were too visible."

From all this it appears what "spirit in the air" brooded over Church and State, people and Parliament, Court and Convocation; and amidst the lowering storm there appear prominent ecclesiastical persons, who may be regarded as representing two currents of opinion and feeling, which set in with tremendous violence one against the other. Atterbury, Archdeacon of Totnes, was the High Church *Coryphæus*. Low Church was his horror; and few of its opponents went far enough to please him. Even Dean Hooper, the Prolocutor, who had manfully fought the battles of his party in 1701, and had led on his coadjutors to one attack after another upon the Upper House; who had figured conspicuously in the unseemly quarrels within the little organ room, at the door of the prelates' chamber; even he and his followers did not please their venerable brother.

Atterbury found in Dr. Wake an opponent less fiery, but as learned as himself without being less acute. There was between them not only controversy in Henry the Seventh's Chapel, but a "Battle of the

\* Cardwell's "Synodalia," 707.

Books," which were scattered all over London and the country, and supplied reading and topics of debate to scores and scores of city dignitaries and rural rectors. Literature was not so comprehensive and abundant as it is in our day ; and then, more concentrated attention fixed itself on ecclesiastical controversies than now. Books on Convocation and cognate subjects, in rude leather bindings ; and pamphlets, many without covers, were despatched from London into the country by slow travelling waggons, to be opened by High Church and Low Church clergymen at their cozy firesides in frosty nights with as much eagerness as their successors now tear off the covers of *The Standard* and *The Daily News*, when controversies are rife as to peace or war. Atterbury and Wake were names well-known, their books were books well read.

Atterbury had attacked Wake—Wake was able to defend himself, and did so in a folio entitled "The State of the Church, 1703," contending, with a good array of authorities, that Convocation, though Atterbury asserted to the contrary, had no right to assemble without Royal licence ; that originally Bishops and Clergy met together ; and that no Prolocutor was chosen before Chicheley's time, about the middle of the fifteenth century. The theory of Atterbury as to the *premunientes* clause in the Bishop's writs he exposed and over-turned, but he ventured on severe censures of clerical irregularities, which, it is alleged, occasioned "the dislike even of very many very moderate men."

## CHAPTER XV.

IN the month of November, 1703, England was visited by a terrific storm. It raged with pre-eminent violence on the western and southern coasts, tearing ships from their anchorage, sweeping away watch-towers and beacons, and strewing the shores of Devon, Cornwall, and Somersetshire with frightful wrecks. Dismantled merchantmen and shattered hulls drifted up the Severn, and some appeared even in the Thames. Fourteen or fifteen men-of-war were said to be lost amidst the rage of the elements; and fifteen hundred seamen are reported to have perished in the waves. Eddystone Lighthouse was washed away. The damage done in London was estimated at a million, that in Bristol at a hundred and fifty thousand pounds. The wind raced and raged amongst forests and villages, fields and cities, plucking up trees by the roots, unroofing thatched cottages, and tearing off ornaments from manor houses and mansions. Bishop Kidder and his wife were crushed to death in their bed at the palace of Wells by the fall of a chimney. Church-steeple斯 swayed from side to side as the hurricane swept round them. Leads on the nave and the choir were rolled up as a scroll, and tiles were scattered like leaves.\*

That storm looks scarcely an exaggerated type of a

\* See Evelyn's "Sylva," II. 350, for a description of this storm.

panic which struck “the religious world” about the same time. We caught the sighing and felt the shock of the rising winds just now, but the increase of the tempest will be seen and felt as we advance. The atmospheric disturbance spent itself in a few days ; that to which I compare it lasted with more or less violence year after year. “The Church is in danger,” has been a frequent cry caught up by the honest and fearful, also repeated in hoarse tones by the hypocritical and designing. Sincerity and fanaticism strongly blend at such seasons, and people lose their heads. Extravagant things said on one side provoke still more extravagant things on the other. Men and women lash themselves into fury. Real evils create imaginary ones. Every object is seen through a distorting medium. No allowance is made for common errors. Those who transgress most against candour and charity, are loudest in the condemnation of minor offences. To be cool and calm is to be indifferent and unscrupulous. To look on all sides is to betray the cause of truth. Half-hearted supporters are denounced as worse than enemies. Just in that way the excitement went on at the time of which I speak. The cry waxed louder and louder, “The Church is in danger.” Members of Convocation echoed and re-echoed the cry. It was taken up by rectors, vicars, and curates, here, there, and everywhere. It inspired inflammatory speeches and inflammatory sermons and inflammatory conversations. In inns and market-places the contagion of fear on one side, of defiance on the other, circulated and spread. Tales were told of calves-head clubs, of wicked Dissenters who gave profane and treasonable toasts, as other tales were also told of wicked Churchmen, who toasted the horse which threw

William, and the mole which occasioned the fall, as "the little gentleman dressed in velvet." Party sermons were preached on the 30th of January, some lamenting the great Rebellion and speaking contemptuously of the glorious Revolution; whilst others attacked the memory of Charles I. and his two sons.

The effect of all this was manifested in the House of Commons by the revival once more in December, 1704, of that inevitable Occasional Conformity Bill. Mr. William Bromley again rose as champion of the Church, to be supported and opposed in long-winded and warm debates. Brought in "with fiery haste" \* it went its way through three readings. The third reading passed by 179 yeas against 131 noes; and as a trick to secure success with the Lords, this Bill was proposed to be tacked to another, the Land Tax Bill, so that to resist the one would endanger the other; but on division "the tackers" suffered a defeat: there were 251 against the manœuvre, and only 134 in its favour. The Queen was present in the Upper House during the debate on the second reading; but though still in sympathy, as she always was, with the High Church party, in reference to this measure her august presence did not overawe the House so as to prevent an increased majority in the third reading, of 71 against 50. Even Marlborough and Godolphin gave negative votes.

The storm whistled louder in Convocation than in Parliament. The Lower House, under Dr. Binks, who had been censured by the Commons in 1702, for an intemperate sermon on the 30th of January, again raised the old dispute, and the Upper House reminded their brethren, that if it was a reproach that they could

\* Stanhope's "Queen Anne," I. 187.

not do business without a licence, it was not a less reproach that with a licence they had just after the Revolution declined business which was proposed to them by the King. With the old dispute was mixed up a reference to Toland's book, respecting which the Clergy complained that nothing had been done; whilst the Bishops pointing out the difficulty of the case, stated that they had recommended the prosecution of the author by his own diocesan. Against their great enemy, the Bishop of Salisbury, they made a complaint, touching a recent ordination charge, in which he had taken occasion to reflect on their conduct: representing them as enemies to the Bishops, to the Church, and to the country. When the Primate prorogued the Houses on the 13th of March, 1705, he told the Lower Clergy that their complaints required no answer, and defended his brother of Salisbury from their aspersions. He referred to their papers as of an undutiful character; told them they had been replied to in the Bishops' observations registered in the Convocation Records; and that the proper place where they should be looked for was Lambeth.

Of all publications, at that moment, the most remarkable was one which aimed at a purpose different from what is suggested by the title-page. Daniel De Foe had taken up his pen, in 1702, and dipped it in gall, to write one of the bitterest satires ever composed. In his "Shortest Way with the Dissenters," he said, that for fourteen years, the glory and peace of the most flourishing Establishment in the world had been eclipsed by a set of men, who audaciously insulted what they ignorantly disliked. But their day was over; their power was gone. The nation's throne was filled with a true daughter of the Church; and now it

was time to crush the viperous brood, so long nourished beneath her wings. Lenity had been fatal. It must not be continued an instant longer. True, the Dissenters were numerous ; yet not so numerous as the Protestants of France, who had been rooted for ever out of their native land. The more numerous, the more dangerous were such people ; therefore the more need for their suppression. The extirpation was not so difficult as some might timidly suppose. The opportunity had come for pulling up the weeds of sedition sown in England's goodly corn-field. As there is no cruelty in killing a snake, neither can there be in destroying those who corrupt posterity, and contaminate mankind. Some beasts are for sport, and the huntsmen give them advantage ; but vermin are knocked on the head at once. "If," said the pamphleteer, "the Gallows instead of the Compter, and the galleys instead of fines, were the reward of going to conventicles, there would not be so many sufferers ; people will go to church to be made mayors, they will go to forty churches rather than be hanged. If Dissenting congregations were banished, and Dissenting ministers tied to the gibbet, there would soon be an end of Dissent."

Many supposed all this was written in good earnest. About fifty years afterwards Burke's "*Vindication of Natural Society*" was supposed by some critics, even Chesterfield and Warburton, to be the production of Lord Bolingbroke, whose theory it was intended to ridicule—and not many years ago Whately's "*Historic Doubts*" could be read by educated people as a genuine piece of scepticism ; so we need not wonder that in an age when Church and Dissent roused furious passion, honest folks took this daring pamphlet as an

exhortation to adopt towards Nonconformity a policy of utter extermination. Dissenters were indignant. High Churchmen shrank from such fierce recommendations, as going too far, though one man at least could be found actually to write and praise the author for a book of value next the Bible.\* We might suppose such a person adopted the author's satirical vein ; the author himself, however, did not think so. At all events, the inflammatory pamphlet was read and circulated. Of course De Foe did not put his name to the strange effusion : but in time the secret leaked out ; and then the excitement rose higher than ever. Those who took the thing in earnest were mortified beyond measure to find how cleverly they had been befooled. Churchmen were enraged to discover that so able a Church advocate turned out to be an execrable schismatic, and that what he had written proved a humiliating satire on their own absurd intolerance. While some Nonconformists chuckled at the exposure, others grieved that such a weapon had been employed on the side of truth and charity, and feared that opposition to their cause now would be hotter than it had ever been before.† The discovery of the authorship increased the desire to read the publication ; far and wide copies were scattered, as so many fire-brands, and the whole country appeared in a blaze. “Down with the Whigs !” “Down with the Presbyterians !” “Down with the Meeting Houses !” shouted thousands of Tory Churchmen. Press and pulpit, club and coffee

\* Wilson's “Life and Times of De Foe,” II. 56.

† De Foe was loud in his professions of Nonconformist principles, but after what has been discovered by Mr. Lee, and applied by Mr. Minto, it is difficult to believe in De Foe's profession of any principles whatever. His cleverness was amazing, and so was his character, but in a different sense.

house, rung with maledictions on the impudent insulter of his fellow-countrymen. Government took up the matter. First, the publication was condemned in the House of Commons, and committed to the flames ; next, the author was indicted at the Old Bailey, and sentenced to pay a fine of 200 marks, to stand in the pillory three times, to be imprisoned during the Queen's pleasure, and to find sureties for good behaviour seven years. The trial and its issue soon produced a reaction. In July, 1703,—before the old Royal Exchange, near the now vanished Conduit in Cheapside, and under the shadow of Temple Bar, just vanishing in our time,—respectable persons acted as a body-guard round the literary convict ; garlands were hung on the ugly machine, and the condemned man mounted it, as if it had been a throne, amidst sympathetic acclamations, whilst his health was drunk in overflowing bumpers.

During the general strife of politics and religion the Queen performed an act, ever since honourably associated with her reign and name. Her birthday fell on a Sunday, February 6th, 1704, and the next day she sent a messenger to the House of Commons, informing them that she desired to grant, for the benefit of the Church, her entire revenues arising out of tenths and first-fruits, imposed by the Pope, and afterwards appropriated to the Crown. These, amounting to between £16,000 and £17,000 a year, were now to constitute a fund for the relief of the poorer Clergy. Burnet takes credit to himself for having suggested such a plan first to William and Mary, and now to Anne.\* However, that might be, the Commons approved of the charitable design, and at her request brought in a Bill enabling the Crown to alienate this portion of the Royal revenue,

\* " *Own Time*," II. 369.

and to create a chartered corporation for the distribution of the bounty. The Statute of Mortmain was repealed, so far as was needful to give effect to the Queen's generous design, which embraced the stimulating of others to an imitation of her own example, by bequeathing money for the augmentation of the fund. That part of the Bill which touched the Statute of Mortmain provoked discussion in the Upper House ; but the Bishops, unanimous in this matter, successfully carried it through all its stages.\*

Passing by this pleasant episode in a stormy period, we reach the summer of 1705, when England was astir from end to end, with a coming election, into which the ecclesiastical element was thrown with exasperating effect. De Foe's "Shortest Way," and other inflammatory publications, together with "the-Church-in-danger" cry, wrought an excitement rarely witnessed even in old-fashioned electioneering days. Patrick, Bishop of Ely, complained in the House that in the election for Cambridge, it "was shameful to see a hundred or more young students encouraged in hollowng like schoolboys and porters, and crying out 'No fanatics !' 'No occasional conformity !' against two worthy gentlemen that stood as candidates."† At Sandwich the Dissenters were extremely active, and a newspaper controversy arose as to whether a flag had or had not been hung out from an Anabaptist Meeting House, emblazoned with "the old Commonwealth breeches and a crown reversed." At Epworth, in Lincolnshire, the High Church incumbent, Samuel Wesley, stoutly opposed the Whig candidates. On the

\* "Parliamentary History," VI. ; Tindal's "Continuation," III. 609 ; Boyer's "Queen Anne," 119.

† "Complete History of Europe for the Year 1705," p. 420.

steps of the parish church, the mob abused him "as rascal and scoundrel," and went on a great part of the night "drumming, shouting, and firing of pistols," under the parsonage windows, where lay his good wife, Susanna, "who had been brought to bed not three weeks before." \*

The result of the elections appeared in October, 1705, at the opening of Parliament. The Whigs had gained an ascendancy on many grounds; perhaps not scrupulous about employing means such as they often attributed to the Tories. The cry of "Church in danger" was now noticed, not that it might be repeated, but repressed. The Whig ministers put into the Queen's hand a speech, in which she complained of malicious insinuations of the Church's peril, and declared her purpose to maintain both the Establishment and Toleration. The Tory Lord Rochester, however, in a debate on the Regency Bill, persisted in representing the Church as in peril, upon which the Whig Lord Halifax challenged him and his party to a debate on the question. Her Majesty, as on a former occasion, appeared as a listener; while Rochester tried to make good his words, and Halifax taunted him with deeds of other days, when his Lordship was a member of the High Commission. Sharp, Archbishop of York, apprehended danger from the increase of Dissent, particularly from the multiplication of Dissenting academies, and he moved, that the Judges might be consulted as to whether there were sufficient laws for their suppression. Compton, Bishop of London, rose to inveigh against a sermon by Benjamin Hoadly, soon to be a name of great renown; a sermon in which, according to the Right Reverend speaker,

\* Tyerman's "Life and Times of Samuel Wesley," 297.

“rebellion was countenanced, and resistance to the higher powers encouraged.” This brought Burnet on his feet, who defended Hoadly, and aimed an arrow at his brother Compton, who, said he, ought to have been the last to complain of such a sermon; for, if the doctrine of that sermon were not good, he did not know what defence his Lordship could make for appearing in arms at Nottingham. The Bishops of Ely and Lichfield, Patrick and Hough, lamented the bitter spirit shown by the Universities towards Nonconformists, and the names which some Clergymen gave their Diocesans; Hooper, now on the bench, in his lawn and rochet, as Bishop of Bath and Wells, regretted the terms “High Church,” and “Low Church;” since the party to which he belonged only desired the Church’s welfare; and the other party he did not believe were averse to Episcopal order. It was voted, by 61 to 30, that the Church was “not in danger,” a decision in which the Commons concurred, by a majority of 212 against 160. A Royal proclamation followed, denouncing all who should propagate scandalous reports about the Establishment, and stigmatizing a much-talked-of “Memorial,” by Dr. Drake, as “a malicious and seditious libel.”\*

Whilst Parliament sat in its accustomed place during the autumn of 1705, Convocation held its meetings close by; and as Bishops would talk to their brother Peers on all-absorbing questions of the day, Deans, Archdeacons, and Proctors would also discuss them with Commoners whose friendship they enjoyed. But on few subjects did the two ecclesiastical bodies come to the same conclusion: and as to the kind of

\* “Parliamentary History,” VI. 479–511, and Burnet’s “Own Time,” II. 434.

loyal address proper at the time they held divergent opinions. The Bishops drew up an address in which they dwelt upon the Church's security ; the inferior Clergy would not concur in it, but proposed another, which while it acknowledged the devotion of the Queen, did not deny that peril was to be apprehended from other quarters. When this fresh document was carried up in due form by the Prolocutor to the Jerusalem Chamber, the Bishops said with all dignity, "We cannot accept your address, you must accept what we propose, or give reasons for rejecting it." At this announcement when reported in Henry the Seventh's Chapel, the assembled members took fire—"An English Synod," said they, "has the right of dissenting from what is proposed by the Prelates, without giving any reason for such dissent." The Fathers of the Church were ready with reproof, as well as reply ; their undifferential sons signified that they would agree to no address which did not emanate from themselves. This defiant policy went much too far to please men of moderate views and calm temper. The Dean of Peterborough at once drew up a protest against the irregularities of his brethren, especially in asserting their independence by claiming the right of self-prorogation, and by putting into the chair a Prolocutor not sanctioned by the Primate. The protest received the signatures of 51 out of 145 members ; but when the Dean endeavoured to read it he was put down by the clamours of the assembly, and at the next meeting the majority voted a complaint against the protesters, and a fresh declaration of Convocation rights. In February, 1706, when they met after the recess, they resolved on a letter to the Bishops, reminding them of previous addresses which waited for

their Lordships' reply. A wide gulf now yawned between the Houses. A stop was put to all friendly communication. The Lower House had held intermediate sessions—and entered on business, approving some books, condemning others.\*

This conduct tired out their Lordships' patience ; and the Queen, most likely at the Archbishop's suggestion, wrote to him a letter dated February 25, 1706, expressing her concern about these prolonged differences, her endeavour to maintain the Constitution of the Church, and her expectation that Bishops and Clergy would act conformably to this her resolution. At the same time she indicated her pleasure that Convocation should be prorogued. The Bishop of Norwich, acting as His Grace's commissary, on the 1st of March, summoned before him the Lower House. Dr. Binks, as Prolocutor, accompanied by some of his brethren, attended accordingly. The presiding Bishop began to read the Royal letter ; Atterbury, the Prolocutor's prime minister, plucked his sleeve, suggesting, "This is no place for us." The Prolocutor, ready to retire, stood irresolute. Up rose Burnet, "springing from his seat," and shouted with characteristic impetuosity, "This is the greatest piece of insolence I have ever seen, to refuse to hear the Queen's orders. Mr. Prolocutor, go at your peril." The reading went on, the Prolocutor remained a few minutes ; but soon the members, foreseeing the inevitable prorogation, rushed to the door determined not to listen ; thus repeating one of those tumultuous scenes which had disgraced the lower Clergy in the days of King William. When the spring came, there appeared with it another Royal letter to His Grace of Canterbury, complaining of

\* This is Burnet's statement : "Own Time," II. 442.

illegal practices being continued, and of reflections cast upon the late prorogation, as unprecedented. This Her Majesty regarded as a plain invasion of her supremacy, and as she was resolved to preserve the Constitution of the Church of England, she would “use such means for the punishing offences of this nature as are warranted by law.” Upon this letter being sent, a fresh disturbance arose. The Archbishop, on the 10th of April, summoned the Lower House to the Episcopal Chamber. Some members went, but not the Prolocutor. He was in the country—they said. This was an intolerable mark of disrespect. Tenison would not put up with it; and pronounced the absent Dean guilty of *contumacy*, reserving the declaration of a penalty until the end of the month. Informed of this, the latter did not feel inclined to brave the consequences. Before the day arrived, a protestation was drawn up against the Archbishop’s proceeding; and this was presented by the Prolocutor. But here again the heart of the Very Reverend President of the Lower House failed him, he begged pardon and submitted to the Primate’s authority, whereupon sentence was waived, and the matter ended. Things being brought to this pass, there followed a series of prorogations, and Convocation did not meet for business after April, 1706, until November, 1710.\*

The union of England and Scotland was effected in 1707. On May-day a general thanksgiving took place. A grand procession to St. Paul’s was followed by a service, in which the Bishop of Oxford preached.

\* Wilkins’ “Concilia,” IV. 636; Burnet’s “Own Time,” II. 412, 441-443, 470, 525. Calamy’s “Continuation,” 688, 713; Lathbury’s “Convocation,” 397, 404; Perry’s “History of the Church,” III. 186-196. There is a letter by Atterbury (III. 272) alluding to an incident not mentioned in these works.

Addresses to Her Majesty poured in from all parts of the country, and the Dissenting ministers of London expressed their gratitude to God, and their congratulations to the Queen, on “the entire union of the two nations,” the settled peace and quiet of her government, the Protestant succession to the throne, and other similar causes for rejoicing. The union involved religious questions. Tories and Churchmen were alarmed. They apprehended danger from so close an alliance between one country under Episcopal, and another under Presbyterian rule. In the Commons, Sir John Packington, in the Lords, Bishop Hooper, spoke against the measure; but the Cabinet, the Liberal Bishops, the majority of the Lords, and the majority of the Commons, were strongly in its favour. The address of the London Dissenting ministers may be regarded as fairly representing the sentiments of their brethren throughout the country; and it may be noticed here that the ultra-Dissenter, Daniel De Foe, who had stood in the pillory, was now entrusted by the Whig Government with important business in the progress of this great transaction. It is curious to notice the want of religious sympathy at that time between the two countries. Separated by a wide, desolate, troubled border-land, and by conflicting traditions and prejudices, with little individual intercourse—in days when a journey from London to Edinburgh seemed like crossing the globe,—the two nations were also alienated, if that be not too strong a term, by ecclesiastical preferences and recollections, also by theological opinions as well as by sentimental impulses. There was first the controversy about Bishops and Presbyters, which had produced a mutual exasperation almost inconceivable; Prelacy was an abomination on the other side the Tweed, and

Presbyterianism a perfect scarecrow on this. Lawn sleeves Scotchmen could not endure, and Genevan cloaks an immense number of Englishmen looked upon with undisguised contempt. The memory of wrongs endured under the Stuarts lingered in the breast of many a Highlander, and many a Lowlander ; and the change wrought in the Establishment of Scotland, the transference of property and prestige from priest to presbyter, was an historical recollection rankling in the mind of the London citizen and the country squire. The strong Calvinism, too, preached in some Edinburgh and Glasgow pulpits, excited aversion in the bosoms of Arminian clergymen occupying pulpits in York and Bristol and Norwich. The whole type of religious feeling expressed in the Book of Common Prayer, and the devotional literature based upon it, occupied another spiritual zone than that filled by the Assembly's Confession and Catechism, and the works to which those formularies had given birth.

Between the Scotch Presbyterian, however, and the English Dissenter, there existed considerable affinity. In dogmatic belief, in public worship, and in personal experience, numbers on both sides were much the same. Still a strong difference might be detected between certain English Presbyterians and Scotch Presbyterians. Dr. Edmund Calamy visited Scotland in 1709, and in his account of the journey some curious instances of what I have said appear. He relates an amusing story of his conversation with a pious woman in North Britain,—who, talking with him about faith and good works, to the latter of which the English divine attached just importance,—exclaimed, “‘ O sir, now you are fallen upon good works, as to them, I must own, that by the report I have heard, I am in-

clined to believe you have more of them with you than we have among us.' 'Well then,' said I, in order to a yet further trial, 'if the belief of what God has revealed, and the fruits and efforts of that belief, where it is sincere and hearty, are the same with us and you, how can it be that you should have the gospel with you, and not we also among us?' 'Ah, sir,' said she, 'you have with you no kirk sessions, presbyteries, synods, and general assemblies, and therefore have not the gospel.' 'And is that then,' said I, 'the gospel? I am sure it is a poor, meagre, and despicable gospel, if you rest there, and carry the matter no further.' \*

There were not wanting, at the moment, plenty of men and women in England—much more learned than that good lady—who attached much the same importance to Episcopacy and Convocation, as she did to her Presbyterian form of Church government. And it is remarkable that Scotch Episcopalians were out of sympathy with their co-religionists in the South, in so much that amongst eleven Episcopalian clergymen in Edinburgh, only one prayed for Queen Anne. With regard to that exceptional person, Calamy says, "I asked if he could mention any other Episcopal meeting, but his own, where the Queen was prayed for? He acknowledged he could not." † The excellent William Carstairs, who had been chaplain to King William, was Calamy's great friend, and invited him to the Metropolis of the North, and between the two there existed a strong religious sympathy and friendship.

Prince George of Denmark, husband to the Queen, died at Kensington Palace, on the 28th of October, 1708. He is described by Smollett, as of an amiable

\* "Life of Calamy," II. 170.

† Ibid., II. 164.

rather than a shining character, brave, good-natured, modest, and humane, but devoid of great talents and ambition. His Royal wife was assiduous in her affectionate attentions during his last moments;\* and as she watched by his dying bed, received support from the renewed friendship of the Duchess of Marlborough, then in waiting as Mistress of the Robes. Intrigues were going on at the time, relative to ministerial appointments. Whigs formed the Cabinet, and the lady counsellor, amidst fluctuations of favour, now enjoyed her mistress's confidence, being addressed in her notes as "dear Mrs. Freeman." "But the reconciliation did not endure."

Anne wrote to the Czar,† saying, "It has pleased God to take to Himself the soul of our dearest;" and—whilst she was at St. James's, thinking of him who lay a corpse at Kensington—heralds were arranging the order of the funeral, and a warrant was sent "to prepare the Royal vault for the interment of George Prince of Denmark;" the Dean and Chapter afterwards put in their claim with that of the heralds to the pall carried at the funeral.‡ Addresses of condolence were presented by religious as well as civic bodies, and among the rest, the Dissenting ministers, headed by Mr. Matthew Clark, waited on Her Majesty and were introduced by the Earl of Sunderland. On this occasion she was not silent as she had been before, but graciously replied, "I thank you for your address and the assurances you give me of your zeal for my person and Government, the union, and the Protestant

\* Burnet's "Own Time," II. 515.

† Stanhope's "Queen Anne," II. 96.

‡ "Report of the Royal Commission on Hist. MSS.," II. 218; IV. 181.

succession." Funeral sermons were preached, in which the virtues of the deceased Prince were commemorated, his conjugal fidelity being extolled in terms, from which "it may be inferred that the age presented many specimens of an opposite kind."<sup>\*</sup>

Prince George, as a foreign Protestant, may be regarded as representing a large religious class then living within our shores, Lutherans, Dutch Reformed, and French Calvinists, who were all allowed liberty of worship. Amongst the French refugees, Camisard fanaticism, which arose in the Cevennes, a violent reaction against violent injustice, appeared in England ; and in some of its manifestations took the form of pretended supernatural utterances. The ministers and elders of the French Church in the Savoy summoned before their consistory three of the "prophets;" and the civil power also dealt with these infatuated offenders. Three of them were convicted, under the statute against blasphemy, and had to stand on a scaffold at Charing Cross and the Royal Exchange with a paper in their hats stating the nature of their offence. Calamy fell in with certain individuals of the party, and relates strange stories of their character and proceedings;† but these visionaries were no fair specimens of French Protestantism. For the most part, the French exiles were steady, sedate, and religiously disposed ; preserving the traditions of their fathers, and suffering by submission to banishment, a terrible penalty, for conscientious convictions. A kindly feeling towards the strangers led to repeated attempts at securing for them here a permanent home ; and in 1709 an Act

\* MS. note to Sermon preached at St. Giles in the Fields, by Thomas Knaggs, M.A., Chaplain to Lord Brook.

† "Life," II. 72, 94, *et seq.*

was passed for naturalizing foreign Protestants, upon their taking oaths of allegiance and receiving the sacrament in a Protestant Church. The Bill, carried in the House of Commons by a large majority, was, when introduced in the Upper House, zealously supported by the Bishop of Salisbury. The Bishop of Chester indeed spoke against it, but the measure met with little opposition.\* A Bill in 1711 to repeal this humane and equitable Act, though carried by a Tory House of Commons, was wisely rejected by the Lords.

\* "Own Time," II. 524.

## CHAPTER XVI.

HENRY SACHEVERELL, grandson of a Presbyterian minister, and son of a Low Church incumbent, a High Church zealot of no common order, now comes upon the stage. He acquired in London a doubtful popularity by advocating passive obedience and non-resistance, and by vilifying Dissenters in the most extravagant style. Preaching before the Judges at the Summer Assizes of 1709, in the county of Derby, and on the significant 5th of November, before the London Corporation assembled in St. Paul's, he denounced the Revolution as an unlawful act ; and bitterly inveighed against the toleration of "the Genevan discipline," as fraught with great peril and adversity to the Church of England. The Tory Lord Mayor, delighted with the sermon, requested its publication, but his motion to that effect met with opposition from a brother Alderman. However, this and the Derbyshire discourse soon appeared in print, much to the joy of the "High Flyers," as they were termed ; much to the disgust of sober-minded people. The audacity of the publication made it popular, and 40,000 copies were soon sold.

Both on political and religious grounds, it roused the indignation of the Whigs, and of the Cabinet which represented their ascendancy. "Shall Sacheverell be

prosecuted?" became a Cabinet question; and with it another question was raised: "Shall he be impeached?" Unfortunately, Sunderland and Godolphin urged the latter course, and prevailed. By a vote of the Commons, the preacher was summoned to the bar for malicious, scandalous, and seditious libels. Thus a worthless adventurer became, in the eyes of sympathizing adherents, exalted to the honour of martyrdom. Articles of impeachment were drawn up, Sacheverell was ordered into custody; and, to demonstrate still further its feeling on the subject, the House thanked Hoadly for good service done by him in a sermon vindicating the principles of the late happy Revolution, and recommended that the Queen should confer upon him some ecclesiastical dignity.

Perhaps there never was, in our country, excitable as it is, a scene more extravagant than that which took place in Westminster Hall during the three long weeks spent over this wretched business.\* Clerks, ushers, Masters in Chancery, judges, peers,—all in full robes,—marched two and two in solemn procession, with a herald in his tabard and a serjeant-at-arms carrying the mace. The Lord Chancellor presided. Eighteen of the Commons were a Committee of Management. There followed a grand display of forensic eloquence. General Stanhope forcibly insisted on the occasional necessity of resisting unrighteous government; and Sir Simon Harcourt, with other advocates for the accused, dared not go beyond the assertion that obedience ought to be the rule, and resistance only the exception—a principle indeed admitted on the other side. They contended that in

\* "The Tryal of Dr. Henry Sacheverell," published by order of the Peers, 1710, p. 1.

the obnoxious sermons, only broad and general truths had been laid down, not at all inconsistent with a full appreciation of the deliverance wrought by William III. The rich, the titled, the fashionable, crowded to hear the pleadings; and the doors of the judgment hall from day to day were thronged by excited mobs. It was plain enough that the ministry had made a mistake. By this proceeding they had roused the fanaticism of former years. The old fever burst out afresh. The “Church-in-danger” cry once more burst out, and rang from lip to lip in ranks composed of those who honestly believed in that watchword, and of many more who were mere partisans, or did not care one straw about the matter, only they liked to share in an uproar. People kissed the delinquent’s hand, and shouted, “Sacheverell and the Church for ever!” as one of the lumbering coaches of the day, accompanied by an enthusiastic procession, rolled along the Strand from the Temple, conveying the champion to his lodgings. When the Queen, who at least secretly sympathized with him, went *incognita* in her sedan to witness the proceedings, mobs gathered round, exclaiming, “God bless Your Majesty and the Church! We hope Your Majesty is for Dr. Sacheverell.” At last the prisoner at the bar read his defence (the composition of which is ascribed to Atterbury), asserting his loyalty, explaining his meaning so as to modify it, referring to the Revolution with respect, and closing with some touches of feeling, adapted to move the hearts of his judges.\* The tone and style of this speech are very different from those of the sermons. When the question came to the vote, 69 pronounced him Guilty, 52, Not guilty. And what was the result?

\* “Tryal,” 333–350.

"All this bustle," Godolphin, full of disappointment, wrote to Marlborough, "ends in no more but a suspension of three years from the pulpit, and burning his sermon at the Old Exchange." This was all the punishment; but the effect in injuring the Government was tremendous. "The fable of the bear that hurled a heavy stone at the head of its sleeping master, on purpose to crush a fly upon his cheek, is a type of the service which on this occasion Godolphin rendered to his party." \*

Not imprisoned, free to go where he liked, only forbidden to preach, Sacheverell visited churches, read prayers, that he could do, and soon set out on a progress through the country, enjoying an ovation and hailed by crowds wearing oak-leaves in their hats, the favourite Stuart badge. He was requested to christen children, that also he could do, with his own precious name. At Banbury and Warwick, the corporation in robes met the popular Divine; and in Shrewsbury, the streets, with their quaint old timber architecture, were lined with 5000 people to give him welcome. A lady at Lichfield used to say, in reference, no doubt, to a later visit to that city, that her grandfather saw Samuel Johnson, a little boy, perched on his father's shoulders, "listening and gaping at the much celebrated preacher." When the father was asked, how he could bring such an infant to church, in the midst of such a crowd, he answered, it was impossible to keep him at home, for, young as he was, he believed the child had caught the public spirit and zeal for Sacheverell, "and would have stayed for ever in the church, satisfied with beholding him." †

\* Stanhope's "Queen Anne," II. 143.

† Croker, (I. 33,) objects that Johnson in 1710 was only three

A letter, just come to light, written by the Bishop of Worcester to the Archbishop of Dublin, 1710, June 30th, opens a window through which we may see what went on. "You cannot but be sensible of the great danger we are brought into by the turbulent preaching and practices of an impudent man, one Dr. Sacheverell, that having been judged guilty of high crimes and misdemeanours by the Parliament of this kingdom, is now riding in triumph over the middle of England, and everywhere stirring up the people to address to Her Majesty for a new Parliament. The danger is so great that I cannot but tremble to think of it, if Her Majesty should dissolve her present Parliament and change her Ministry, which is the thing driven at by the addresses. But withal it is so visible that I hope that Her Majesty cannot but see it through all the false colours they put on it." "This is like to be the overturning of all in our present circumstances, and it is surely so understood by all the Papists and Nonjurors of this kingdom."\* The rejoicings of Sacheverell's friends were not all of a harmless character. The mob gutted Burgess' Chapel, in Lincoln's Inn Fields, and then burnt him in effigy; and it is amusing to learn, that at Cirencester, people got up a match between two cocks, to whom they gave the names of the High Church and Nonconformist Divines. Unfortunately, Cock Burgess killed Cock Sacheverell.

Sacheverell did what he could in his progress to secure the restoration of the Tories to power and the calling of a new Parliament. Whatever might be the months old ; that is an objection to the date, not the substance of the story.

\* "Report of Hist. MSS. Commission," II. 245.

extent of this demagogue's personal influence in the matter, the object was accomplished. The Whigs resigned. Tories came into office. The general election of 1710, which ensued at this crisis, turned much on an ecclesiastical question.

“Join, Churchmen, join, no longer separate,  
Lest you repent it when it is too late.  
Low Church is no Church.”

Thus ran one of the placards in the Middlesex contest: it is but a specimen of many more. The Tories succeeded. In 1711, the Whigs again aspired to office, on the ground of objections against a peace, which, after the English victories, the Tories wished to establish. The Tories were charged with being friends to the French, and, to enlist Protestant sympathies on the side of the aspirants, a pageant was planned in November against Rome and Romanism—ridiculing holy water, sandals, copes, beads, bald pates, and pregnant nuns. People dressed up an effigy of the Pope under a silver-fringed canopy, accompanied by the Pretender on the left, and the devil on the right. The exhibition was intended to take place on the 17th of November, the anniversary of Queen Elizabeth's accession, a day very dear to English Protestants; but the Ministry, under the apprehension of a popular tumult, prevented the completion of the ridiculous pageant.

The Tory Lord Nottingham, whose name is identified with the Occasional Conformity Bill, at this juncture, for certain personal reasons, effected an alliance with the Whigs; and a coalition between the two parties ensued on this compromise, that Nottingham should join the Whigs in opposing the peace, and that the Whigs should join Nottingham in his oppo-

sition to occasional nonconformity. First we see an onslaught in the Upper House by this restless nobleman on the articles of peace, who succeeded in carrying a majority with him ; and next we find him bringing before the House, on the 15th of December, the old Bill, defeated again and again, which now, in substance, by virtue of a compact with new allies, was carried at last. The Bill provided “that all persons in places of profit and trust, and all the common-council men in corporations who should be at any meeting for Divine worship (where there were above ten persons more than the family) in which the Common Prayer was not used, or where the Queen and the Princess Sophia were not prayed for, should upon conviction forfeit their place of trust or profit—the witnesses making oath within ten days, and the prosecution being within three months after the offence ; and such persons were to continue incapable of any employment till they should depose, that for a whole year together they had been at no conventicle.”

The Bill was supported in the Lords by old opponents, and carried without a division ; and on its reaching the House of Commons, “they added a penalty on the offender of forty pounds, which was to be given to the informer.” The excuse by the Whigs, a very sorry one, for this departure from their former proceedings and principles is, that by yielding, “it might go towards quieting the fears of those who seemed to think the Church was still in danger, till that Act passed.” Thus, says Calamy, writing at the time, “after fifty years’ exclusion from the public churches by the Act of Uniformity, during the one half of which they were exposed to great rigours and severities, though during the other half they have had more

liberty, are the poor Dissenters excluded from the service of the State. So far are we from any hopes of a coalition which has been so often talked of, that nothing will do but an entire submission.”\*

In appropriate sequence to the intolerant Act just now described, came the famous Schism Bill. It was hatched by Bolingbroke, whilst Atterbury sat by the nest encouraging the incubation. In the Address of the Lower House of Convocation, in 1704, mention was made of allowing persons to act as schoolmasters, “without such licence from the Ordinary as is required by the Act of Uniformity and the 77th Canon ;” and in the Lords’ debate about the Church being in danger, Archbishop Sharp had alluded to the same thing. Now, therefore, in harmony with the revival of old intolerance, and in violation of the Revolution policy, this Bill proposed that no one should keep school, or act as tutor, who did not conform to the Church of England, and obtain a licence from the Diocesan ; failure in doing so was to entail imprisonment. No licence was to be granted without a certificate that the party applying for it had received the sacrament at church within the year before. Sir William Wyndham introduced the Bill in the House of Commons on the 12th of May, 1714. Sir Peter King, Mr. Hampden, Sir Joseph Jekyll, and Robert Walpole, spoke against it ; but General Stanhope excelled in his enlightened opposition. “He showed in particular the ill consequence of this law, as it would of course occasion foreign education, which, on the one hand, would drain the kingdom of great sums of money, and, which was still worse, would fill the

\* Burnet’s “Own Time,” II. 585, and Calamy’s “Abridgment,”  
725.

tender minds of young men with prejudices against their own country. He illustrated and strengthened his argument by the example of the English Popish seminaries abroad, which, he said, were so pernicious to Great Britain, that instead of making new laws to encourage foreign education, he could wish those already in force against Papists were mitigated, and that they should be allowed a certain number of schools." In spite of this convincing argument the Bill was carried by a majority of 237 against 126. In the Lords, the second reading was moved by Bolingbroke, who probably urged the sophism he expressed in a letter to Wyndham : "The evil effect is without remedy, and may therefore deserve indulgence ; but the evil cause is to be prevented, and can therefore be entitled to none." Lord Wharton justly contended, that to call that schism in England which had been established in Scotland, was truly absurd ; and that it would be only consistent in the advocates of this Bill to bring in another making Episcopacy schismatical across the border. Lord Halifax insisted on the contrast between this infringement of the rights of Dissenting subjects with the encouragement afforded to Walloons and Huguenots. Lord Townsend cited Holland as an example of the good effects of free education. But all in vain. The Lord Treasurer wished to soften the most rigorous clauses, and absented himself at the final vote ; amendments were proposed, a few of which were carried, to the effect that Dissenters might have schoolmistresses to teach their children to read ; that the conviction of offenders should be transferred from justices of the peace to courts of law ; that a right of appeal should be allowed ; and that tutors in noblemen's families should be exempt from the new statute.

It was further moved on the Tory side that the Act should be extended to Ireland ; and thus finally framed, the whole Bill was adopted by 77 peers against 72. The Bill went back to the Commons to be adopted by them, after an attempt to alter one of the amendments. "And thus was passed through both Houses one of the worst Acts that ever defiled the Statute Book." But it never took effect ; for the day on which its operation was to commence, proved to be the day of the Queen's death. The new Government suspended its execution, and afterwards it was repealed.

Convocation was permitted to enter on business in November, 1710, and the political change which had taken place made itself felt in Henry the Seventh's Chapel. The members were in an exultant mood. Atterbury was chosen Prolocutor ; a licence to debate was allowed ; certain points for discussion were specified ; but the Archbishop was not, as is usual, appointed president ; nor was His Grace, or his Right Reverend brethren, consulted relative to the business. "These things," said Kennet, who had been set aside as a candidate for the chair, "looked plausible for the Church, but were suspected to be meant for the State only, and to blacken the late ministry, as if the new set were all Christians and saints." Atterbury drew up a representation on the state of the Church, which was accepted in his own House, and rejected in the other.\*

William Whiston was professor of mathematics in the University of Cambridge—a man of eccentric genius, bold in the utterance of opinion, and strong in personal resentments. Few men were more talked

\* For these and preceding particulars see Stanhope, I. 81 *et seq.*, Lathbury, 408, and Boyers' "Anne," 110.

of in his day. His position, not at all owing to rank or wealth, was a singular one. Whether he is to be ranked amongst Churchmen or Dissenters it is hard to say; for though he did not identify himself with any of the Dissenters, he occasionally at least conducted worship after a fashion of his own. His mind was occupied with two ideas, which he maintained incessantly, during a long life, first, that the Athanasian Creed is most unscriptural, unreasonable, and pernicious; secondly, that the Apostolical Constitutions, as they are called, present the ideal of a Church, to which all Christians should conform. “I run no hazard,” he said, “as to another world because I keep close to the faith and practice which was once delivered to the saints without suffering any synod or human authority to turn me all out of the way.”\* In a book entitled, “An Historical Preface to Primitive Christianity,” he asserted what was offensive to Churchmen; and now that Convocation was in a favourable position, and the Lower House felt its strength renewed, some of the members determined to take up Whiston’s case, and seek an authoritative condemnation of his heresies. Accordingly the House agreed that a Representation of the State of Religion and the Church should be prepared, and after certain points had been selected, the composition of the document fell into Atterbury’s hands. He set to work in his own slashing style to expose the evils of the day, and amongst them he denounced all such as dissented from the Church, especially Socinians and Quakers; meetings for worship held by the latter are pointed at as the scandal of the age, and those who sympathized with

\* “Hist., MSS. Com.,” V. 399. Several curious letters by Whiston are noticed in the same volume.

William Whiston are described as “the determined enemies of all religion and goodness.” This “Representation,” however consonant with the views of the Lower House, the Upper House would not adopt ; and as to any proceedings in Whiston’s case, the cautious Archbishop expressed an opinion that there were great difficulties in the way of censuring the book, or condemning the author. The Upper House, in accordance with his judgment, resolved to address Her Majesty on the subject, and seek for light in the midst of the darkness which enveloped the question. The case was referred to the Judges, and eight out of twelve gave it as their opinion that Convocation had jurisdiction in cases of heresy ; but reserved their judgment in this particular case, intimating however that they might alter their opinion on further inquiry. The other four concluded that Convocation has no power over cases of heresy. The Queen’s Council supported the majority of the Bench, and an answer being returned accordingly, the Bishops took up *the question of the book alone, without adopting proceedings against the author.* Arian and heretical propositions were extracted and were sent down to the Lower House. Atterbury and his friends wished to pursue the matter, and it was again brought before the Queen, but no answer was returned ; and when, months afterwards, two Bishops were deputed to wait on Her Majesty, they were told the document forwarded could not be found. Other deputations followed, to receive the same answer, “The paper is lost.” There ended the business. But certain topics recommended by the Queen were considered, and a report was agreed upon by both Houses.

Atterbury’s “ Representation of the Present State of

Religion " occasioned new differences between the two Houses. They could not unite on the subject. Drafts were prepared on one side and rejected on the other, so that the proceedings became involved in complication and mystery, and to seek a way through the labyrinth, would answer now no useful purpose. If we are to believe a gossiping letter, Burnet reported, most likely in reference to the topics specified by Her Majesty for the consideration of the Clergy, that the Lord Treasurer said, he had bamboozled the Convocation by setting them to work only to burn their fingers.\*

In December, 1711, Convocation assembled again, when fresh differences arose between the Houses :—one respecting lay baptism, which, by members of the Lower House, was declared to be invalid ; but the Bishops, in different forms of expression, virtually admitted its validity. In February, 1713, Dr. Stanhope—Dean of Canterbury, and author of “Discourses on the New Birth and Election,” which, though not Calvinistic, and affirming in some sense Baptismal regeneration, are in the main what would be termed Evangelical—was chosen Prolocutor, but nothing of any interest occurred, except the adoption of an Address to the Queen, on her recovering from illness ; and the preparation by the Bishops, of forms of service for the visitation of prisoners, and the admission of converts from Popery. In June, 1714, a dissension arose on the merits of a book, entitled, “The Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity,” published by Dr. Samuel Clarke. The views he advanced were deemed unsound, and the Lower House applied to the Upper, stating that his doctrines were inconsistent with the Catholic

\* Atterbury’s “Correspondence,” II. 322 ; Cardwell’s “Synodalia,” 764 ; and Lathbury’s “Hist. of Convocation,” 417.

faith of the English Church. Clarke drew up a qualifying paper, which satisfied the Bishops, but not the inferior Clergy. The business of Parliament and Convocation came to an end on the 9th of July, when a prorogation took place by the Queen in person. In three weeks Anne was no more. She was interred in Henry the Seventh's Chapel, on the 24th of August, 1714. "Her unwieldy frame," we are assured, "filled a coffin larger even than that of her gigantic spouse," by whose side she was buried, in the same vault with her Royal sister.

## CHAPTER XVII.

THE more conspicuous Prelates during the reign of Queen Anne have come before us. But there are two or three others who claim a passing notice.

Sharpe, who, though a good man, seems in his latter days to have narrowed his sympathies, and confined them completely within the walls of the Establishment, had for his successor, Sir William Dawes, of whom some absurd stories are told which I do not care to repeat. It is said, whether truly or not, that he “laid by the elegance of dress for an ecclesiastical habit with the greatest pleasure in the world, looking upon Holy Orders as the highest honour that could be conferred upon him.”\* I find it difficult to estimate some of these dignitaries justly, for the most opposite descriptions are given of their character. John Robinson, for example, “a little brown man of a grave and venerable countenance,” who succeeded Compton, is treated by Stackhouse with perfect contempt, as incompetent to sustain the Episcopal office; but some one else describes him as charitable, good humoured, and strictly religious. Offspring Blackhall became Bishop of Exeter in 1707, and is chiefly known as the author of a long series of Discourses explaining our Lord’s Sermon on the Mount. He quoted Chrysostom, and

\* Noble’s continuation of “Granger,” II. 78.

reminds me a little of that great orator in this respect, that from the pages of the English preacher, is reflected the state of contemporary society ; not, however, so vividly presented as by him of Constantinople, yet so as to place the habits of his audience in no very favourable point of view. Of Philip Bisce, who attained the Bishopric of St. David's in 1710, and proceeded to the See of Hereford in 1712, the chief acts recorded are, that he made the choir of the Cathedral the neatest and most ornamental in the kingdom ; that he rendered the parish churches of the city very beautiful and splendid ; and that he devoted three thousand pounds to the repairs of the palace.

Turning to the Clergy at large, we find there were among them men described as active "parish priests," rectors, and vicars, who attended to their duties with conscientiousness, and went down to the grave in peace, leaving names to be inscribed with honour over their graves ; or, what is better, to be enshrined in the hearts of loving survivors. Memoirs of such men are not often written, and what might be their number no one can tell.

One good representative example occurs. There was a Clergyman named John Bold ordained in 1702 ; he served the curacy of Stoney Stanton, near Hinckley, his stipend being but thirty pounds a year, which, added to a salary of ten, received as schoolmaster during a portion of his life, made him just as rich as Goldsmith's parson. "Remote from polished and literary society, which he was calculated both to enjoy and adorn, he never cast any longing lingering looks behind, but girded up the loins of his mind for diligent service in his narrow sphere." Conscientious in the discharge of his duties on the Lord's day, and in

connection with fasts and festivals, he was exemplary in visiting his parishioners and in holding catechetical meetings, so that an old man said: "I have often at the ringing of the bell on Saturday afternoon, left my plough for half an hour for instruction, and afterwards returned to it again." Out of a scanty pittance Bold saved ten pounds a year for charity; and with all his care and thrift "he had a great regard to the neatness of his person and the decorum of his dress." "He always wore a band and a large decent gown which folded over, and was bound by a sash; he exhibited no variety of apparel to accommodate himself to different companies."

It was impossible that the Clergy should escape the intellectual enthusiasm of the times. The number of literary men in the Church was great. Bentley remained Master of Trinity, Cambridge, deep in classical studies as well as deep in disputes with the Fellows of his college. Strype, from 1709 to 1733, continued hard at work on his "*Ecclesiastical Memorials*" and "*Annals of the Reformation*." Norris did not finish his quiet career as a Platonic philosopher until 1711, and William Derham, who had caught the mantle of John Ray, went on, to the end of life in 1735, plodding at scientific studies in the Rectory of Upminster, of which we have results in his now almost forgotten "*Physico-*" and "*Astro-Theology*." Among other literary names, less known, we meet with John Morton, Rector of Great Oxendon, author of "*The Natural History of Northamptonshire*," digging up fossils and writing letters on local antiquities; Uvedale, Master of the Grammar School, Enfield, a botanist, collecting and examining plants, about which he carried on a laborious correspondence; William Smith, Rector of Melsonby,

Yorkshire, a skilful antiquary, great in numismatics, a friend of Thoresby's, and author of "The Annals of University College;" and Thomas Brett, of Springrove, extremely inquisitive respecting all kinds of out-of-the-way matters.\* Correspondence of theirs, snatched from destruction, affords a lively picture of employments going on in obscure parts of the country, such as the examination of Roman pottery, the deciphering of ancient inscriptions, the settlement of disputed dates, and determinations as to ancient and extinct offices.

Numerous Clergymen were mainly intent upon rising in the Church. Learned men hoped by their learning to win for themselves posts of emolument and honour; and men unlearned, but trusting to aristocratic connections, party zeal, and pleasant manners, were aiming at the same object. A Bishop's throne, a good deanery, a rich prebend, a valuable rectory, were prizes which fired ambition; and when a see was vacant, or a good living fell in, immense flutterings of hope and fear followed in the breasts of time-servers. Addison, in the *Spectator*, has his eye on characters of this sort when he divides the Clergy into generals, field officers, and subalterns—the first including Bishops, Deans, and Archdeacons; the second, Doctors of Divinity, Prebendaries, and "all that wear scarves." Competitors for the first class were numberless. In the second divisions several brevets were granted; "so that lute-string rose twopence a yard." Subalterns were innumerable; and if the Clergy imitated the laity by splitting freeholds, they would "carry most of the elections in England."† Seekers after preferment

\* Notices of these men are found in Nichol's "Literary History."

† *Spectator*, Vol. I., p. 118.

mostly frequented the higher walks of society ; but besides these we must reckon a large number of Clergymen who occupied the lower fields, and spent their time in idle ways. Their circumstances were miserable, and their habits in accordance with their circumstances ; to them belonged the class pictured in darkest colours. Doubtless men were still to be found such as existed in the seventeenth century ; but the social status of the profession in general, I believe, considerably improved in the course of the following age. On the whole, however, in spite of the popularity of the Church under Anne, in spite of its literary ornaments, in spite of members truly good numbered amongst its sons, the way in which Clergymen at large were spoken of in periodicals is not respectful, and indicates no friendly sentiments towards them. Allusion is made to “An appendix to the Contempt of the Clergy,” in which was to be set forth the laziness of persons in holy orders, showing that “none of the present schisms could have crept into the flock but by the negligence of the pastors.”\* According to Burnet, who was not prejudiced in favour of his brethren of the lower Clergy, their lives generally were not immoral ; but they were not exemplary, not religious, in any deep meaning of that word, not zealous in their Divine Master’s service, not seeking to save souls and glorify God. Amongst the clerical celebrities of the day was Orator Henley—whom Pope has immortalized, or rather gibbeted, “embrowned with native bronze.” Warburton, in his notes to the “Dunciad,” has also perpetuated the remembrance of discreditable charges brought against him ; but the facts of his life, stripped of violent caricature and sheer calumny, seem to

\* *Tatler*, Vol. II., p. 156.

have been as follows : Henley was a person of considerable ability, and possessed of such oratorical fluency and skill as strike the multitude. After having been schoolmaster and provincial curate, he came up to London, and soon made himself popular by his eloquent delivery of florid discourses. He inveighed against many of his brethren as *humdrum drones*, and so excited their wrath ; and to the ridicule of his sensational preaching, were added imputations on his moral character, which, whether true or false, lowered him in public estimation. In consequence of this, he lost the promise of preferment, and was required by his Diocesan to leave London ; whereupon he resigned his connection with the Establishment, and set up, under the name of the Oratory, a place of worship in Newport Market, under a licence granted according to the Toleration Act. There he carried on a liturgical service framed out of the Prayer Book, and the Apostolical Constitutions ; and from the latter collection took two creeds, which he substituted for those of Nicæa and Athanasius. The building was highly decorated, and the worship was rather ritualistic to please Churchmen ; extempore prayer was also employed to attract Dissenters. He declared himself a Church Reformer, and suggested the institution of a London University ; at the same time, attacking what he esteemed to be ecclesiastical and political abuses. By degrees he became less and less religious in his orations, and at last preferred taking up public questions of the day, rather than texts of Scripture, or spiritual themes. His discourses degenerated into inflammatory harangues, and having excited an uproar, an information was laid against him ; but, after a short detention, he was set at liberty. An examination

into the particulars of his story does not support the abuse of Pope, and the statements of Warburton ; but he appears to have been ambitious of distinction, and not much under the influence of religious principle. His popularity was a rocket-like affair, and though he was neither profligate nor profane, nor a mere buffoon, his career ended in disappointment and mortification.\*

The Ecclesiastical buildings of the age demand some notice. Amongst the muniments of Westminster Abbey brought to light by the " Royal Commission on Historical MSS." are several papers indicating repairs and additions at the commencement of the eighteenth century. Dr. Birch, subdean, the prebendaries, and Sir Christopher Wren were appointed in 1698 to carry out the works ; the time-stained records referred to, enable us to see the scaffolds at that time raised outside the venerable edifice, and workmen climbing ladders, masons renewing stones, and the western towers rising under the superintendence of the great architect. St. Paul's Cathedral was completed after an expenditure of more than three-quarters of a million ; and the architect, whose removal from the office of Surveyor-General, separated him from the building which he raised, as well as the building which he altered, retired to study and to contemplation, "cheerful in solitude, and well pleased to die in the shade as in the light." There is a touching story told by Horace Walpole, that the fabric which Wren raised in the metropolis "left such an impression on the mind of the good old man, that, being carried to see it once a year, it seemed

\* There is a careful sketch of Henley, founded on contemporary authorities, in the "Retrospective Review," XIV. 206.

to recall a memory which was almost deadened to every other use.”\*

Until of late years, deep galleries and coats of arms with “the lion and the unicorn fighting for the crown” continued in parish churches, giving a tolerably clear idea of what they were under Queen Anne. There is a story that the high-backed enclosures on both sides of the aisles originated about that time, occasioned by complaints that the maids of honour and the gentlemen of the Court, at Whitehall and elsewhere, spent their time in looking at one another, instead of attending to their religious duties. The dimensions of the pews as to width do not seem to have been diminished; and they long retained a capaciousness which entitled them still to be styled “rooms” as they had been called before. Notices are preserved of the custom of men and women sitting apart at church; and it is curious to find in parish accounts an item of this kind, “Paid for sweeping the church and whipping the dogs, ten shillings.”† When funeral sermons were delivered, friends of the deceased were invited to hear them, and to dine afterwards, horses being sometimes provided for the occasion. The ceremony of interment often took place after dark. We know that the burial of the dead in the aisles, and of the Clergy in the chancel, was a common practice; and the statement often occurs, respecting a deceased incumbent, “He was buried under the communion table.”

Fifty new churches after the Great Fire had been by Act of Parliament ordered to be built, when, in the tenth year of Queen Anne, another Act was passed for

\* Milman’s “*St. Paul’s*,” 445.

† “Report of Hist. MSS. Com.,” V. 571, Parish Documents of Hartland, N. Devon.

the building of fifty more, to redress, as stated in a subsequent Commission, “the inconvenience and growing mischiefs which resulted from the increase of Dissenters and Popery.” Sir Christopher Wren’s churches are well known, and they well illustrate the ecclesiastical taste of the times. Many of the interiors are still admired, particularly that of St. Stephen’s, Walbrook, with its cupola and columns. These interiors have been divided into three classes, the *domed*, such as that now mentioned ; the *basilical*, that is with nave and side aisles ; and the *miscellaneous*, including rectangular, single-aisled, and other plans. These churches are described as generally in the Roman style ; but, with some Gothic exceptions, “none have the form of the Latin cross.”\* A remarkable church, not much known, was built in Queen Anne’s reign, at Little Stanmore, close to Edgware. It has a nave, but no side aisles, and a small chancel three steps higher, separated by oak columns. There is a gallery at one end, with an organ, on which Handel often played. Coloured figures of the Evangelists and other designs cover the walls, the blue ceiling is powdered with stars, and side panels contain pictures of New Testament events. In connection with these church-building operations it may be mentioned that Burgess’ old and incommodious Meeting House was purchased, and turned into a Chapel of Ease at a cost of £600 ; and that “Hamlet” was acted at Drury Lane, with “an entertainment of dancing,” in aid of the building fund.

Turning to the Universities, we find that Jacobite sentiments prevailed at Oxford. The spirit of acquiescence in despotic rule, manifested by the famous decree

\* Clayton’s “Plans, Elevations, etc., of Sir Christopher Wren’s Churches,” 1848.

of 1683, revived in the reign of Anne ; if indeed it had ever drooped, except in feigned surrender, for a while when William occupied the throne. The heads of houses and other leading men threw their influence into the scale of Tory Church politics, and few of the gownsmen escaped the taint, the effect of which upon the country at large may be easily conceived. The minority of Whig Churchmen lived for a time on civil terms with their contemporaries ; but in 1715 a furious strife broke out between a Constitutional club, which met to drink health to King George and confusion to the Pretender James—and the Jacobite party, who watched the proceedings of the rest, and stirred up the riffraff of the city to make an assault upon them. "Down with the Whigs," "No George," "James for ever," were cries, resounding through the streets ; and the mob attacked a Presbyterian meeting-house, and carried off the pulpit to be burnt. Such conduct, under the inspiration of University men, of course, damaged the reputation of the University itself ; and we do not wonder to find that a design was entertained of vindicating it "from the odious and unjust charge of disloyalty to his Majesty King George."\* What came of the design I do not know. Architectural works were superintended in the College of Christ Church, during the reign of Anne, by Sir Christopher Wren, to whom it owes the renowned campanile, whose sonorous bell is so familiar to the ears of Oxford residents, and so eagerly listened to by Oxford visitors ; and in 1714, Worcester College was founded on the site of Gloucester Hall, first built for the education of Greek Protestants ; and until Keble College rose in our day, it was the

\* A folio of seventy-six leaves to that effect is mentioned in the third Report of the "Hist. MSS. Com.," p. 194.

last new foundation in the University on the banks of the Isis. In those days the antiquary, John Hearne, was a distinguished notability, and filled the office of Architypographus and Beadle, a position, one might think, which would insure a quiet life ; but, instead of that, the learned bibliopolist plunged into hot water with the Bodleian authorities, and the Vice-Chancellor, at a meeting in the Library, threatened twice, in a great passion, to send him to the Castle. The quarrel originated in something which Hearne had written, if indeed the cause lay not deeper, in the fact of his Non-juring sentiments, and of his not having taken the oaths of office. Instead of being put to prison, he retired to Edmund Hall, and there privately carried on his studies, adorning by his erudition and researches a community with which, unfortunately, he could not live in peace. He was a type of a large class of students who united High Church opinion and feelings with an absorbing devotion to archaeological pursuits ; and nothing could be more felicitously descriptive of such a character, than the text inscribed on his grave-stone, “ Remember the days of old, consider the years of many generations : ask thy father, and he will show thee ; thy elders, and they will tell thee.”

The Annals of Cambridge at that time are barren of interest. The chief records relate to loyal addresses presented to the Sovereign ; a visit by Anne, when she was received with ceremonial displays akin to those at Oxford ; a deputation sent to Frankfort on the Oder, to celebrate the Jubilee of the University there ; the banishment of William Whiston for heresy ; a theological disputation at the commencement of 1714 ; the bestowment by King George of Bishop Moore’s books under the title of the Royal Library ; questions in the

King's Bench as to Dr. Bentley's title to the Regius Professorship of Divinity ; new buildings on the western side of King's College Quadrangle ; and a running fire of election contests and disputes between Gown and Town. But a remarkable instance of Church activity in the way of popular education is found in Cambridge ; and it serves to illustrate the imperfect mode of proceeding adopted in those days. In 1703 the Clergy of the town, and the heads of Houses, with other dignitaries combined to launch the undertaking. Subscriptions were obtained from the inhabitants, and so prosperous was the enterprise, that by Christmas, masters and mistresses were chosen for the education of 260 poor children—a number shortly increased to 300, who were divided into six schools, each having its own master or mistress ; and it is interesting to notice how unknown then were our ideas of the monitorial system, and of the management of a large school by one presidential instructor. Six separate establishments were then deemed needful for three hundred boys and girls. The same kind of effort was made elsewhere ; but soon the “religious difficulty” cropped up, and with it another difficulty, happily not familiar to us at the present time. These charity schools, though some of them were aided by Dissenters, were turned to purposes which Dissenters condemned, and which even some of the English Church dignitaries disapproved.

The Bishop of London noticed what he calls, “a heavy objection,” that in many of the schools children were trained up in disaffection to the Government, and he said, “'tis a point that the Government is nearly concerned to look after, since it is to little purpose to subdue and conquer the present ill-humour, if a succession of disaffected persons is to be perpetually

nursing up in our schools." But his Lordship added afterwards, "there is not at the present the like grounds to complain of disaffection in our charity schools that there was some years ago;" yet he acknowledged, "that while the Protestant succession remained doubtful, and no stone was left unturned to defeat it, some persons who had their views a different way (*i.e.* Jacobites) endeavoured to get the management of these schools into their hands, and to make them instrumental in nourishing and spreading an aversion to the Protestant settlement." These passages throw light on the way in which clergymen were working; how much better they liked the House of Stuart than the House of Hanover; and how they sought to get the education of the country into their hands, that they might, if possible, accomplish a counter Revolution. Another perversion of charity schools is noticed, namely, the use of them for poisoning the minds of children against Nonconformists, and for promoting High Church views. No attempt at separating between religious and secular education, no elementary schools, supported by Government, for the children of the poor in general, then existed. Education, in point of fact, took a denominational form; Church people aimed at making children Church people, like themselves; and Dissenters, in self-defence, had to establish schools of their own.\*

In reference to the religious life of the period as it appeared at Court, it is to be noticed that Queen Anne was fond of going to church; and is said to have behaved herself with unusual decorum during worship. It had been a custom for clergymen on entering the

\* See "An Essay towards the Encouragement of Charity Schools," by I. Watts, 1728.

pulpit to bow to Royalty, and as Princess she had returned the courtesy ; but William never did, not even when a Bishop preached. Whether the lady continued her former practice after she ascended the throne, does not appear : certainly she never neglected to notice the Clergy in friendly ways. When popular preachers visited town, she commanded their services ; and when King, Archbishop of Dublin, came on a visit to London, and had “customers enough from all parts to beg sermons ; he preached before the Queen in her chapel, and to a great auditory at St. Margaret's, Westminster.”\* The behaviour of lords and ladies in the Royal chapel I fear was not very decorous ;—ogling, whispering, and slumbering, seem to have been common, especially under preachers who had no distinguished gifts of oratory. Burnet and Sprat might rivet attention and reconcile even frivolous courtiers to sermons of more than an hour's length ; but not many of the chaplains could vie with them. Political excitements, the rise and fall of ministries, Convocation questions, and “the-Church-in-danger” cry, might at times, in absence of worthier causes, rouse the listless auditor, and inspire some curiosity to learn on which side the preacher leaned.

Leaving the Court to glance at the City, we notice that the nave of new St. Paul's was never profaned like the nave of old St. Paul's. Burdens were no longer carried through it, nor did Serjeants-at-law hold consultations with their clients under its arches ; it ceased to be a regular promenade : but, in 1725, some years after Anne's death, the Bishop of London noticed the custom of walking and talking in the nave, as being so common and scandalous, that he threatened to put

\* “Hist. MSS. Com.,” II. 234.

in force the 18th Canon, and the Act of William and Mary, by which people guilty of irreverent behaviour were liable to be fined twenty pounds. The *Spectator*—that looking-glass, which reflects the manners of the times—shows how ladies went to church to display their charms, and ogled and stared at the congregation; how people repeated the responses in a tone of voice as loud as that of the minister, to the confusion of the whole service; how in a pew it was in the power of a coxcomb to utter what a woman could not avoid hearing; how some one seldom came till prayers were half over, then held the hat before his face for two or three moments, bowed to his acquaintance, sat down, took a pinch of snuff, and, at evening service perhaps, a nap; how, unlike Roman Catholics, and unlike Mohammedans, many people whispered and smiled, and winked and nodded, when they ought to have been absorbed in worship; and how gentlemen, when they heard what they did not like, would manifest dissatisfaction “with odd looks and gestures, and confer together in so loud and clamorous a manner, continued to the end of the discourse, and during the after-psalms, as was not to be silenced but by the bells.”\* Bad reading in those days, as in our own, was the subject of much public and private comment, and Steele, in the *Spectator*, dwells with delight on Divine worship at St. James’s, Garlick Hill, where he heard “the Service read so distinctly, so emphatically, and so fervently, that it was next to an impossibility to be inattentive.”†

The maintenance of anything like ecclesiastical discipline in connection with the Establishment, had been

\* *Spectator*, Nos. 14, 53, 236, 242, 380, 503, 630.

† *Spectator*, No. 147. Aug. 18, 1711.

felt more or less from the earliest period to be exceedingly difficult ; indeed, beyond the exercise of it in a few glaring instances of immorality, it was completely impossible. It had been a puzzle under the Commonwealth, when an earnest attempt had been made to carry it out. It had been neglected after the Restoration, and under Queen Anne only occasional endeavours were made by clergymen to secure purity of Communion. Whiston relates two cases, which came within his own knowledge, of improper characters being forbidden to approach the Lord's table ; but they are mentioned as things quite out of the common way, and we are left to infer that amongst Church communicants there must have been considerable numbers of dissolute persons. Parish clerks, according to the *Spectator*, were a privileged class ; for they are caricatured—with grave countenances, short wigs, black clothes, mourning gloves, and hat bands,—meeting on certain days at taverns, and feasting upon “the florence and the pullets,” “which they ought to send home to their own houses, and not pretend to live as well as the overseers of the poor.”\*

The charm of Anne's reign is found in literary associations, which concentrate in London. There were clubs at which wits assembled, to discuss politics, to review the controversies of Convocation and the Church, to crack jokes, and to criticise new publications. Within the unimposing doorway of Button's Coffee House, on the south side of Russell Street, Covent Garden, might be seen Addison and Steele, Swift and Pope, with a host beside. In Tonson's shop might be found theologians, poets, philosophers, and historians gossiping with the renowned printer. By him were published the prin-

\* No. 372. “The florence” was a wine so called.

cipal works, great and small, in every department of literature, which stimulated, if they did not satisfy, the mental cravings of the day. From his counter issued from time to time the *Spectator*, in a single leaf, and the *Tatler* and other periodicals, the appearance of which on the tea-table was anticipated with as much eagerness as *The Times* when we go down to breakfast. The literary world which thus centred in the metropolis ought to be noticed in connection with the Church, because so many distinguished men were identified with it ; some of them, like Addison, being moral and religious instructors. It is said that papers in the *Spectator* were written by him as sermons when he thought of entering the Church ; and it may be observed, by the way, that Nonconformist Divines as well as laymen contributed a number now and then to that popular periodical, Dr. Watts and Mr. Grove of Taunton being included in the number. If some writers adopted sceptical opinions, and wrote after a fashion unfavourable to religion and morality, it is to be remembered, they did not thereby forfeit, either in the eye of the law or in the judgment of their neighbours, a claim to be considered members of the National Church. Many of them went on Sunday to their parish places of worship, from fashion or for amusement ; and some of them probably contributed to the unbecoming scenes which the *Spectator* with delicate satire described and condemned.

In the provincial cities of England, and in the cloisters and closes of cathedrals, we find what may be emphatically termed the Church life of the age. Foxe's "Book of Martyrs," might be seen chained to a desk in the halls of palaces and deaneries. Goodly libraries, public and private, existed within those quiet retreats,

and the dignitaries who dwelt within the precincts found ample time for study and devotion. There bishops retired when Parliament broke up. There students like Kennet carried on their researches, and men like Dawes enjoyed good living and good company. Devout spirits, such as Stanhope, attended daily Service ; and popular preachers like Atterbury occupied the pulpit on Sundays. Pleasant was the life spent in these sheltered nooks. Few pictures are more grateful than the quaint-looking prebendal houses of that period, with trees and gardens round about, rooks cawing on winter mornings, and cathedral bells chiming on summer evenings in the ears of well-to-do dignitaries. Pity it was, that time and revenues largely at command were not husbanded for the benefit of immediate neighbourhoods lying in destitution and neglect.

The incomes of livings were very unequal, some were rich, and some were poor, many hundreds under £20 to £30 a year. Curacies could scarcely rise above such rectories ; and if I may add to what I have advanced on the subject already, I would quote what Swift says respecting the circumstances of the humbler Clergy :— “ The vicar is generally sure to find on his admittance to the living a convenient house and barn in repair, with a garden, and a field or two to graze a few cows and one horse for himself and his wife. He has probably a market very near him, perhaps in his own village. No entertainment is expected by his visitors beyond a pot of ale and a piece of cheese. His wife is little better than Goody in her birth, education or dress, and as to himself we must let his parentage alone. If he be the son of a farmer it is very sufficient, and his sister may very decently be chamber-maid to the

squire's wife. He goes about on working days in a grazing coat, and will not scruple to assist his workman in harvest time. His daughters shall go to service or be sent apprentice to the sempstress in the next town, and his sons are put to honest trades."\*

No better guide can be found to what was interesting in the villages of that period than the *Spectator*; and by this help we can explore the church, survey its furniture, and become acquainted with the congregation. Parish politics were discussed in the churchyard, both before and after service. The walls of the church were decorated with texts of Scripture; there was a handsome pulpit cloth, and new railing round the Communion table, both provided at the generous Squire's expense. Everybody had a hassock given, as an encouragement to prayer, and an itinerant singing-master guided the rustic choir. People napped under the sermon, practising ingenious devices to disguise the doze, and the singing often fell out of tune, and out of time. Service ended, the Squire walked down from his seat in the chancel, between a double row of tenants, who stood bowing to him on each side; and every now and then he inquired how such a one's wife, or mother, or son, or father did, whom he could not see at church. There were catechizings, and the boy that answered well had a Bible given him.†

Sweeping conclusions as to the state of society can give no satisfaction to any one who desires to bring judicial impartiality to bear on his inquiries. It is common to draw from certain indisputable facts infer-

\* "Essay on the Fates of Clergymen." Swift is not an unexceptionable witness, but on the whole his testimony may be admitted with some little allowance.

† *Spectator*, No. 112.

ences of universal range. No century, perhaps, has been treated in this way more frequently than the eighteenth. The pages of the *Spectator* bear witness to the existence of immense folly ; and no reader can fail to discern, beneath and beyond all that folly, a vast amount of vice, however varnished by ingenious fashions. Numbers of men and women in the upper circles, for whom Addison and others chiefly wrote, must have been deeply immoral. But *how far* the descriptions apply, it is difficult to decide. Pictures of the beautiful, as well as the base, are portrayed by these artists ; and no doubt there were realities corresponding with the first class of descriptions as well as the second. On the whole, a painful, not a pleasant, impression is produced. Nor can we help feeling that, however well meant, the playful satire of the wits had little power to correct what was so skilfully exposed. Nor in the learned and moral discourses then commonly delivered in churches, was there much healing virtue.

## CHAPTER XVIII.

THE History of Religion in England after the accession of the House of Hanover, includes no such stirring Parliamentary events as those which I have largely described in former chapters ; hence my labours in this respect are lightened. During the Civil Wars, and the Commonwealth, the proceedings of Lords and Commons were to a wide extent occupied with Ecclesiastical questions, and the various Acts passed in the reign of Charles II. touching Church and Nonconformity are conspicuous in our national Statute Books. The story of the Revolution, and the settlement under William III., is also in its most interesting aspects and details mainly religious ; and in Queen Anne's reign, politics were inextricably interwoven with the fortunes of the Church. But on reaching the reign of George I., a change comes over the compass and drift of our narrative. Few Acts of Parliament require attention. Few discussions carried on by Lords and Commons demand any notice ; and Convocation no longer crosses our path, as its deliberations were silenced and its controversies suspended. Though for the present we shall not get free from political entanglements, and rebellions will have to be described, yet a predominant amount of study has now to be devoted to what may

be called the internal history of religious affairs, and religious life.

Further, it should be remarked that a new epoch in the religion of England commenced with the opening of the Georgian era, inasmuch as the Act of Toleration, so called, then became accepted by most parties, and an end was put to that kind of persecution which had harassed Protestant Nonconformists for nearly two centuries after the commencement of the Reformation. Popular outbreaks against Dissenters sometimes occurred, but so far as Law and Government were concerned, full liberty of worship was allowed except to Roman Catholics.

On the death of Anne, Atterbury, Dean of Westminster and Bishop of Rochester, suggested to Lord Bolingbroke, that James Stuart should be proclaimed at Charing Cross, and expressed his willingness to lead the procession, in his lawn sleeves.\* Bolingbroke being too cautious to plunge into such an enterprise, Atterbury is said to have exclaimed, "There is the best cause in Europe lost from want of spirit." A very different person from Atterbury at that moment took precedence in the proclamation of George of Hanover. Thomas Bradbury was a popular Independent minister, officiating at a meeting-house in Fetter Lane. It is said of him—to his credit in the estimation of some, to his discredit in the estimation of others,—that "Politics were a part of his religion;" and whilst Sacheverell made the pulpit a rostrum for the proclamation of High Church authority, Bradbury made it a tribune for the assertion of ecclesiastical and civil liberty. "Bold

\* The original authority for this anecdote I have not ascertained; but it is adopted by so careful an historian as Earl Stanhope. ("Hist. of England," I. 94.)

Bradbury," he was called by the Queen ; and the story goes that Harley proposed he should be offered a bishopric, with the hope of silencing the troublesome orator. That would have been as useless as was the violence employed to put him down ; for neither threat nor bribe had any influence over a nature of his description. The populace, in the riot of 1710, burnt his meeting-house ; "he was," as he says, " lampooned in pamphlets, derided in newspapers, threatened by great men, and mobbed by the baser sort," but none of these things moved him. Referring to the commencement of his ministry—he began to preach at eighteen,—he could say, "I bless God, from that hour I have never known the fear of man." On the summer Sunday morning as the Queen was between life and death, he walked through Smithfield in a pensive mood, probably on his way to Fetter Lane, when Burnet, who resided in Clerkenwell, drove by, and seeing the Dissenting minister, whom he well knew, asked him, "why he looked so very grave." "I am thinking," replied Bradbury, "whether I shall have the constancy and resolution of that noble company of martyrs, whose ashes are deposited in this place ; for I most assuredly expect to see similar times of violence and persecution, and that I shall be called to suffer in a like cause." Burnet at once raised Bradbury's hopes by informing him of Her Majesty's precarious condition. He was himself going to the Palace, he said, and promised to send a message to his Nonconformist friend when all was over. The Queen died whilst Bradbury was preaching ; but by a preconcerted signal—the dropping of a handkerchief from the gallery—intelligence of the event, from the Bishop, reached the preacher before the sermon had finished. The preacher restrained himself

until the concluding prayer, when he implored the Divine blessing on the Hanoverian heir, “George, King of Great Britain and Ireland ;” and then gave out the 89th Psalm from Patrick’s collection. Bradbury prided himself on being the first person to proclaim the Protestant succession ; and his joy at the change in the Government was shared, not only by Dissenters, but by Whig Churchmen. Of course Burnet was delighted ; and White Kennet, afterwards Bishop of Peterborough, wrote to a friend, “I am fixed in this opinion, that King George is one of the honestest men, and one of the wisest princes in the world.”\*

In Glasgow a mob, professedly Presbyterian, most inconsistently proclaimed their joy at what they hailed as the return of toleration, by breaking into the Episcopal chapel and driving out the clergyman. But a Lutheran King from Hanover seemed as odious to Non-jurors and High Churchmen as a Calvinist King from the shores of Holland. No wonder that men like Atterbury were incensed at seeing such an occupant of the throne ; and multitudes there were who would have been glad to have beheld the Jacobite Bishop issuing in his canonicals from the Deanery, to proclaim the Stuart exile Sovereign of these broad realms. Indeed, Jacobite mobs assembled at Bristol, Norwich, Birmingham, and other places, to clamour against Anne’s successor.

At his first Council, September 22nd, George I. took occasion to express his determination to support and maintain the Churches of England and Scotland, adding, “which I am of opinion may be effectually done, without the least impairing the toleration allowed by law to Protestant Dissenters.” The ministers of the

\* Ellis’ “Original Letters.”

three denominations in London, waited on the new Sovereign, to express their warm attachment to his person and Crown, and their joy at His Majesty's recent declaration. A hundred of the brethren crowded together before the King, who stood there, as described by Horace Walpole, "rather good than august, with a dark tie wig, a plain coat, waistcoat, and breeches of snuff-coloured cloth, with stockings of the same colour, and a blue riband over all." Dr. Williams took the lead, he and the rest of the party dressed in black cloaks, "according to the fashion of the Court on that occasion." "Pray, sir," said a nobleman to Bradbury, "is this a funeral?" "Yes, my lord," he retorted; "it is the funeral of the Schism Bill, and the resurrection of liberty." Archbishop Tenison, aged, feeble, tottering, placed the crown on George's head, and soon afterwards cheerfully sang his *Nunc Dimittis*. Atterbury, taking part in the coronation ceremony, offered to relinquish the chair of state and the Royal canopy, which were perquisites of his office, an offer which, whatever the motive, was rejected decidedly.

Addison gives it as a common report circulated at the time by "the High Flyers," that "all the churches in London were shut up, and that if a clergyman walked the street, ten to one, he would be knocked down by a schismatic." \* Such rumours roused revenge in the provinces, and riots occurred in the Tory county of Stafford, and elsewhere. "High Church and Ormond for ever!" was a popular cry. The Duke of Ormond, in fear of an impeachment by the Whigs, had just escaped to France, saying to Lord Oxford, then in the Tower, "Farewell, Oxford, without a head;" to which Oxford replied, "Farewell, Duke, without a

\* *Freeholder*, No. LII., p. 7.

duchy." Mobs pulled down meeting-houses, demolished Dissenters' furniture, and committed other acts of violence. Manchester was a scene of immense disturbance. The bells rang out merry peals at Warrington, whilst people on the birthday of the Pretender, dressed in Sunday clothes, marched about, crying out, "The Church in danger! Down with the Dissenters! God save James III.! " Jacobites assembled at beat of drum, denouncing all Whigs, all Low Churchmen, and all Nonconformists. Rebellion followed the riots of 1715. An outbreak in the Highlands spread southward. The Jacobite insurgents made an attempt on Edinburgh, and marching across the border, entered Lancashire. There Roman Catholicism lingered, and kept a tenacious hold on the affections of certain English families. In one of the glens of the wilder portion of the county, near Holme, in a grand old park, the Townley family had lived since the days of King Alfred; and now, in a Tudor mansion, with gateway, chapel, sacristy, and library, they carried on mediæval worship under the ministrations of a priest, who said masses "*pro rege nostro Jacobo*," and performed baptisms, and kept anniversaries recorded in a curious register book, between the vigil of St. John the Baptist, 1705, down to the end of December, 1722, all of which has been brought to light by the Historical MSS. Commission. It was just the place to become a centre of Jacobite influence and action, so here, also in other ancient houses, and among the commonalty too—for many of the lower classes were in this respect in full sympathy with the upper—the Chevalier found earnest supporters ready to fight for the restoration of his line.

Many an Episcopalian Tory also was ready to join  
VOL. V.

the rebel ranks, though some Protestant sympathizers were taunted by Popish friends, as being never valiant, except in drinking toasts. Even Scotch Presbyterians espoused the cause of James; but when fallen among Lancashire Presbyterian witches, they yielded to their fascination and changed the white cockade for Hanoverian colours. In London and in other parts of the country, clergymen might be found who in opinion and feeling were one with the Northern Jacobites, and things began to wear a serious aspect in the estimation of the ruling powers. The Government actively employed itself in subduing alarm and repressing rebellion; hence Whig Churchmen and zealous Dissenters took up arms on the Royal side. One Woods, a minister at Chowbent, figures in the history of that day, as raising a regiment out of his congregation, "to draw up on Cuerden Green" with "scythes put on straight poles," or with "spades," or with "bill-hooks." And it is a tradition, that he drew his sword on the only member who evinced any fear, ordering the "coward to leave the men, and go home to the women." Warm work went on in the North; bloody battles were fought at Sheriff Muir, and on the banks of the Ribble, near the town of Preston. Barricades were raised in the streets, and shots were fired from the windows; but the Hanoverians were too strong for the Jacobites, and a total defeat befell the latter. Soon afterwards, numbers of prisoners were brought to London to lie in the Tower, and in Newgate, and then to be beheaded on Tower Hill, or hanged at Tyburn.

Nonjuring sympathy in the cause which brought to the block the Earl of Derwentwater and Viscount Kenmure, was unmistakable and intense. Clerical

influences in favour of the rebellion were met by clerical efforts on the other side, the pulpit being employed for denunciations, founded on the words, "Rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft ;" whilst Jacobites preached from the words, " Shall the throne of iniquity have fellowship with thee which frameth mischief by a law ?" Political excitement in some cases led to disgraceful disturbances in churches ; and Nonjuring places of worship were riotously assailed. Those who frequented them wore as a token of admission a small black badge, recognizable only by the door-keeper, while public signs of adhesion to the Pretender were white roses. On one occasion six and twenty Nonjuring clergymen attended the funeral of a deceased brother ; and after the execution of a young Jacobite, named Matthews, a large number gathered together at night around his early grave. One James Shephard, a fanatical youth of eighteen, who wrote in a letter, " How meritorious an action will it be to free these nations from an usurpation they have laid under these nine and twenty years," was arrested in 1717, it appears, through information conveyed by a Nonjuror ; but he was attended to his execution by another, whom the miserable lad owned to be his father confessor, declaring that " he desired their prayers only, who were of his own communion." Howell, ordained by Hickes, was sentenced to be whipped, fined, and imprisoned, for a pamphlet published by him ; a second person was convicted for keeping a Nonjuring conventicle, where His Majesty's name was omitted in the prayers ; a third was tried at the Wells assizes, and sentenced to the pillory and imprisonment, for seditious sermons ; and a fourth had to stand at the bar on some inexplicable and absurd charge about

making a collection in such a way as to invade the King's prerogative.\* In all this, one is equally struck with folly on one side, and severity on the other.

The year of the Rebellion saw important changes in the Episcopate. In the spring Burnet's career came to an end. The public conduct of this bustling Prelate has been so conspicuous in our history, that no further notice of his character as an ecclesiastical politician is required; but it is pleasant to add an account given of his private habits. "His constant health permitted him to be an early riser: he was seldom in bed later than five o'clock in the morning during summer, or than six in the winter. Private meditation took up the two first hours, and the last half-hour of the day. His first and last appearance to his family was at the morning and evening prayers, which were always read by himself, though his chaplains were present. He drank his tea in company with his children, and took the opportunity of instructing them in religion. He went through the Old and New Testament with them three times, giving his own comment on some portion of it, for an hour every morning. When this was over, he retired to his study, where he seldom spent less than six, often more than eight hours a day, the rest of his time was taken up with business, exercise, and necessary rest, or bestowed on friendly visits and cheerful meals."†

Burnet was succeeded by William Talbot—translated from Oxford—a name of little renown, except as father of Lord Chancellor Talbot; and soon afterwards, in 1715, Benjamin Hoadly, who, ten years before, had

\* These cases are found in Calamy's "Own Life," II. 390, and in Lathbury's "Hist." 305.

† Life of the author, appended to his "Own Time," II. 722.

made himself popular by his sermon before the Lord Mayor, was raised to the Bishopric of Bangor, in the room of John Evans, the deceased Diocesan. In the summer of the following year, 1716, Lloyd, Bishop of Worcester, expired in the rambling Episcopal palace, known as Hartlebury Castle, after reaching the age of ninety. This Revolutionary magnate, so fond of studying unfulfilled prophecy and of fixing a date for things to come, survived the period at which he calculated that Rome would be destroyed ; for he told two young Vaudois friends that if they lived to the year 1716, they might stand on the top of their mountains and warm their hands in the flames of the Papal city.\* On the death of Lloyd, Hough was translated to Worcester, and Edward Chandler followed the renowned defender of Oxford College rights, as Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry. But the most important Episcopal change at this period occurred at the close of the year 1715, when the aged Tenison passed away, just before Christmas. Like Burnet, he had private virtues, which could not be denied by his most virulent enemies ; and his legacy of £1000 to the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, towards the endowment of two American Bishops, and his foundation of a Library bearing his name, tended to soften the feeling against him. Wake, already noticed as an opponent of Atterbury, was now exalted to the Primacy, owing, as was supposed, to a speech he made, when Bishop of Lincoln, on the trial of Sacheverell.

Within two years after Wake's appointment to the Primacy, he engaged in a correspondence which makes some figure in the ecclesiastical history of his times. In the year 1717 France was in a state of great

\* Calamy's "Own Life," II. 384.

agitation in consequence of the Papal Bull called *Unigenitus*, that being the first word occurring in the document. It was levelled against the Jansenists, it fell in with the policy of the Jesuits, their determined enemies ; and by many staunch members of the Gallican Church it was deemed an act of aggression upon their liberties. Amidst this state of things the correspondence referred to took place. It was carried on chiefly between the Archbishop and a Chaplain to the English Embassy at Paris. It seems to have originated in a communication to His Grace from the famous Dupin of the Sorbonne. He had heard from the English Chaplain, that the Archbishop made honourable mention of him ; and consequently he wrote to His Grace, expressing desire for a union between the English and Gallican Churches. Wake replied, insisting upon the purity of the English Church, and stating as his own persuasion, that there were few things in it which even his French correspondent would desire to see changed. He took occasion to urge the maintenance and enlargement of Gallican liberties, for which the disputes arising out of the Bull furnished an occasion ; and, in connection with this advice, he expressed his readiness to concur in the promotion of union between the Protestant and Roman Catholic Churches. Another ornament of the Sorbonne, Piers de Gerardin, exhorted his brethren to revise the Gallican rule, so as to prove that they did not hold as an article of faith every decision of the Pope, and moreover he spoke of union with Anglicans as more hopeful than union with Greeks. The English Chaplain, after this, corresponded with the Archbishop on the subject, and the Archbishop wrote several letters in reply. Dupin also prepared advice, relating

to the method of reunion, and commented on the Thirty-nine Articles, showing how far he could adopt, and how far he must contradict them. Wake did not go into minute particulars, but earnestly insisted on the renunciation of the Pope's supremacy by the Gallicans, as essential to success. He then laid down the principle that each national Church is competent to manage its own affairs ; and, that respecting doctrinal belief, communities desiring union should agree as far as possible, and then tolerate unavoidable differences. Notwithstanding, he was for " purging out of the public Offices of the Church, all such things as hinder a perfect communion in Divine Service, so that persons coming from one Church to the other might join in prayers, the Holy Sacrament, and the public service."\* This correspondence, carried on secretly for a time, was at length divulged ; the Jesuits rose in arms ; the Abbé Du Bois interfered ; Dupin died, and the affair came to nothing. At a subsequent period, and in some measure springing out of this interchange of views between Wake and Dupin, the former engaged in another correspondence with Father Courayer, who, in 1727, was moved, for some reason, strange in a foreigner, to publish a defence of Orders in the Church of England, based upon documents forwarded to him by the Primate. Such an act aroused the indignation of his French brethren, and in consequence he came over to England, and was kindly received by the Archbishop. He never openly abandoned the Church of Rome, nor formally declared himself a member of the Church of England, but attended mass in London, also occasionally worship-

\* Mosheim's " Ecclesiastical History," edited by Maclaine, Vol. VI., Fourth Appendix, 126-195.

ping in the parish church of Ealing. He lived to the age of ninety, and was buried in Westminster Abbey. The attempt made to effect some union between the two Churches, naturally led to misapprehensions; Wake became suspected, if not of betraying, yet of imperilling, Protestant interests. But he is not fairly open to such a charge. He contended for the purity of his own Communion, and made no concessions that implied any leaning to Roman Catholicism. Yet it is a wonder that he should have held out any hope of union between two organized communions so differently constituted as a Church built on the Book of Common Prayer, and a Church built upon the Missal and the Tridentine decrees. Episcopacy in common, however strongly held, and however highly estimated, can never prove a ligature sufficient to hold together such a society as that which rests on the Reformation of the sixteenth century, and those societies against which the Reformation was an unmistakable protest. Whatever may be thought of the communications between Wake and Dupin, they did not proceed on an original idea. Ever since the Reformation, schemes for re-uniting Christendom had been proposed and discussed. John Dury had been indefatigable in seeking to promote that attractive object. Leibnitz, the German philosopher, had corresponded with a Romanist Divine in the hope of bringing Lutherans and Catholics together. Crowned heads had favoured the scheme; Electors of Hanover, Dukes of Wolfenbüttel, and other potentates, had backed theologians seeking to contrive points of assimilation between alienated Churches. Even Bossuet had caught something of a dovelike temper, so as to enter into friendly negotiations, always saving the rights of his own Church. Terms of armistice, if not

treaties of alliance, had been the order of the day for some good while, when Wake took up his pen in response to Dupin. They failed where others had done ; but both deserve credit for cultivating sentiments proper to the Gospel of peace.

The dissenting ministers of London, in the month of August, as news came slowly from Lancashire about the rebellion, waited on the King, when they were assured that the treatment their brethren had received in some parts of the country excited Royal concern, and that a full compensation should be made for their sufferings. The King appreciated the services they had rendered, and felt anxious they should be released from the injustice of the Occasional Conformity Act. He conversed with Nicholson, the Bishop of Carlisle, on the subject, who told him that eighteen of the Bishops opposed the contemplated measure. "What reasons have they for not consenting to the proposed Bill of repeal ?" he immediately asked. "Because the Bench, in supporting the Act, thought it would be for the service of the Established Church," was the reply. "But have not the Dissenters since that time given good proofs of their loyalty ?" rejoined the Sovereign. "Yes, sir," added the Prelate ; "but the toleration was thought a sufficient recompense for their fidelity to King William, and the security of that is all that the honest men amongst them seem to desire." \*

Fresh disturbances occurred in May, 1716. On the one side, people were barbarously treated for wearing oak-leaves in their hats as a Jacobite demonstration ; and on the other side, a Nonconformist meeting-house

\* "State Papers," Record Office, Dom. 1716, March 19th. Letter of the Bishop of Carlisle.

at Cambridge was attacked, plundered, and almost demolished ; the scholars of Clare Hall, well known as liberal Loyalists, being shamefully insulted. Soon afterwards, when the rebellious Scotch noblemen had been executed, a clergyman was hung at Tyburn for treason, declaring that he died a son of the true Church of England, not of the schismatical branch, which sprung up under the Prince of Orange. He desired the Clergy of the Revolution Church “to consider the bottom they stood upon, when their succession was grounded on an invalid deprivation of Catholic Bishops by a pretended Act of Parliament.”\*

In the spring of the next year, 1717, we find the three denominations again at Court, following Calamy, with his handsome features, curled wig, large bands, and flowing gown, as he presented an Address on the restoration of peace. “His Majesty,” says the presenter, “who used to receive us on such occasions standing, was now sitting under a canopy, and I was led up to him under my arm, by Mr. Secretary Stanhope, through a lane of noblemen and attendants.” The King thanked the Dissenters for their loyal address, and said, “I will give orders for the speedy payment of the damages they sustained in the late tumults.” Encouraged by marks of Royal favour, Dissenters took courage to move for a redress of grievances ; and, accordingly, meetings were held to promote the repeal of the Occasional Conformity and Schism Acts, and the Test and Corporation laws.

On the 13th of December, 1718, Earl Stanhope brought a Bill into the House of Lords for that purpose. He eloquently asserted the rights of Dissenters, condemning oppressive laws as the creation

\* Calamy’s “Own Life,” 357.

of troublous times. Sunderland and Stamford supported the motion, but the new Archbishop of Canterbury, and Dawes, Archbishop of York, opposed it; the former, probably in allusion to De Foe's well-known sentiments, contending "that the scandalous practice of occasional conformity was condemned by the soberest part of the Dissenters themselves; and he could not forbear saying that some among them made a wrong use of the favour and indulgence that was shown them upon the Revolution, though they had the least share in that happy event." Such a strain of remark could not but be exceedingly offensive to those who, with few exceptions, had rejoiced in the expulsion of the Stuarts, and who felt that what the Primate called "favour and indulgence," was only a concession of that to which they were as much entitled as His Grace could be to the honours and emoluments of his high position. Other members of the Bench followed on the same side; but Hoadly, Gibson, Kennet, and Willis advocated the Bill. Kennet, with his black patch, standing up in his lawn sleeves, became so excited as to exclaim—much to the horror of some of his brethren, and also of Lord Lansdowne, who smartly rebuked him—"the Clergy of Charles the First had promoted arbitrary measures and persecutions, until they first brought scandal and contempt upon the Clergy, and at last ruin both on Church and State." Yet such really was the fact; and it was only honest in the Prelate to warn his brethren against following a bad example. For the Bill there were 86; against it, 68; with this small majority it was deemed expedient to drop that part which referred to the Test and Corporation Acts, and for the present to be satisfied with the repeal of the Occasional Conformity and Schism laws. When the

Bill reached the Commons there arose a long debate, the particulars of which are but briefly reported ; but, it appears, some members who had once been Dissenters, zealous for what they regarded as the interests of truth, proposed that the liberty of religious ministration should be restricted to those who would subscribe to the doctrines of Divine Inspiration and the Trinity of the Godhead. The proposal was resisted by Barrington Shute, afterwards Lord Barrington, a liberal Dissenter, attending worship at church as well as at chapel, a learned theological author, and a man of considerable ability, who had been employed by the Government in promoting the union of England and Scotland. “Vehemence” is attributed to his opposition ; and for some reason—perhaps the liberality of his doctrinal opinions, together with the liberality of his ecclesiastical practice—Barrington did not enjoy the confidence of Nonconformists. The attempt to clog the repeal of the obnoxious law passed in the late reign utterly failed, and the measure passed the Commons by a majority of forty-one.

Convocation was permitted to meet for business in the year 1717 ; and in May we discover the Lower House busily at work upon two pamphlets\* of the Bishop of Bangor. In the first there was little to which any one could object, except Nonjurors and Jacobites ; the second was different. Some principles laid down were so similar to those adopted by Nonconformists, and led so directly to either disestablishment or a thorough alteration in the Church, that it is difficult to understand how Hoadly could reconcile his

\* “A Preservative against the Principles and Practices of the Nonjurors,” and a Sermon on John xviii. 36, preached before the King.

teaching with his position. However that might be, he brought on himself the wrath of the Lower House, which came to the conclusion, that the tendency of the Bishop's work was to subvert all government and discipline, and also to impugn the Royal supremacy in ecclesiastical cases. Foreseeing the storm likely to arise, Government interfered before any action had been taken on the report; and at once prorogued Convocation until the 22nd of November. With that prorogation the powers of Convocation were suspended, and continued to be so down to our own times. No licence was granted after 1717, and nothing except matters of form occurred in these meetings of the Clergy. Attempts were repeatedly made to revive their activity, but all in vain, until 1852. What followed in connection with Hoadly must not be identified with the history of Convocation. "The Bangorian Controversy" was taken out of its hands, and the battle was fought beyond the walls of Westminster Abbey.

It is surprising to find what an excitement the Bangorian dispute produced—an excitement which rivalled, if it did not surpass, any in Nicene or Puritan times. It engaged the pens of at least fifty authors, and in a single month above seventy pamphlets were published. We are told that at one period even business on 'Change was interrupted by this strange agitation, and that it really caused some London tradesmen to close their shops.\* The controversy turned upon different points. It included certain *principles*, as appears from the conclusions adopted by Convocation in reference to Hoadly's writings. The nature and limits of both political and ecclesiastical authority came

\* Hoadly's "Works," II. 429.

into debate ; his political views being opposed to the Divine right of kings, and the dogma of non-resistance to absolute rule—which some of his antagonists, with various modifications, ventured to maintain. He was, altogether, what may be termed broad and low, giving up the idea of Apostolical succession, the notion of a ministerial priesthood, and the High Church conception of sacraments. He said, that Christ was the only Lawgiver in the Spiritual kingdom, and the sole Judge of behaviour in the affairs of conscience ; that He has appointed no vicegerents and no interpreters ; since to have done so, would have been inconsistent with His own supreme rulership—“for whoever hath such an authority for making laws is so far a king, and whoever can add new laws to those of Christ equally obligatory is as truly a king as Christ Himself is. Nay, whosoever hath an absolute authority to interpret any written or spoken laws is he who is truly the lawgiver to all intents and purposes, and not the person who first wrote and spoke them.”\* The Church, however, he admitted, has authority in matters of faith, but it is the authority not of a judge, only a witness, and does not touch the right and duty of private judgment. “The favour of God,” he maintained, “follows sincerity, considered as such, and therefore equally follows every equal degree of sincerity.”† Such statements were, of course, disputed by a number of Churchmen ; and amongst them were Law and Sherlock, both formidable antagonists. Law, a keen logician, grappled with Hoadly’s main principles, maintaining that his argument against delegated human authority in the Church went too far, and upset the

\* Hoadly’s “Works,” II. 404.

† Hoadly’s “Second Letter,” 32.

very idea of a ministry entrusted with means of grace ; and that to admit the innocence of error was to give up the old ground on which the Church has ever stood in the warfare against heresy. Sherlock, Dean of Chichester, did not so much dispute Hoadly's conclusions, as differ from him in the method of reaching them, contending that certain inferences drawn by opponents from Hoadly's principles, did by no means follow, when those principles were properly stated ; in other words, that the Dean's way of engaging in the controversy was free from objections bearing against the mode adopted by his friend ; it should be added, that as to the exclusion of Dissenters from political offices, they did not agree. Hoadly does not appear to have been clear and consistent in his statements, or thoroughly logical in his reasonings, or calm and Christianlike in his temper ; but his aims were liberal, his course persistent, and he certainly met with a good deal to irritate and provoke him. He seems not to have apprehended the fair application of his own principles as stated in his sermon before the King, principles which would lead, in the estimation of most persons, to Nonconformity or disestablishment, to both of which, as a Bishop of the English Church, he was averse. The controversy led him to defend himself, and in doing so he modified meanings which had been attached to words he had used before. In this controversy *facts* were disputed as well as principles. What Hoadly really meant became a question of fact about which there was keen dispute ;—also how far he and Sherlock differed from each other was a tough bone of contention. Here Sykes, a supporter of the Bishop of Bangor, appears on the stage, contending that there is no difference between the views published by Sher-

lock and those published by the Bishop—saying to Sherlock, “If my Lord Bishop be guilty of what you have charged him with, the Dean of Chichester is guilty of the same crime.” Besides this, the question arose, again and again, as to whether certain other persons had said what was attributed to them, and this led to a number of *personalities* which, above everything else, disfigured the dispute. Dr. Snape, who threw himself into the far-spreading contention, inquired, whether Hoadly had not submitted his famous sermon to some one before he preached it, and adopted in consequence some qualifying expressions. Hoadly denied that he had, when Snape undertook to bring forward a person who would prove the contrary: one person after another was mentioned, who had heard something from somebody else, until it was affirmed that Dr. White Kennet had said the sermon had been submitted to him. When Kennet heard this, he denied having said anything of the kind; but still Snape and others maintained the report was true. “The present disputed veracity will be for a great while everybody’s talk,”\* is a remark made in the correspondence of that day. Other things too were swept within the eddies of this enormous whirlpool, including points of Biblical interpretation, the history of the Test and Corporation Acts, and, worst of all, matters of private scandal. One Pilloniere, formerly a Jesuit, resided as tutor in the Bishop’s family. Snape spoke of him as helping the preacher in his notorious sermon. Pilloniere then wrote an account of himself, to which Hoadly supplied a preface. But enough has been said on the subject of this controversy, which fills fourteen octavo volumes. It originally turned upon important questions of prin-

\* Nicolson’s “Correspondence,” II. 461.

ciple, and then degenerated into what Calamy calls "an unhappy squabble," which "did a great deal of mischief."\* No doubt it did.

And so did the manner of conducting another controversy, about the same time, within the circle of Dissent. Dr. Samuel Clarke, dissatisfied with the Athanasian Creed, and William Whiston, who went further than Clarke, had considerable influence among Nonconformists of "a liberal way of thinking." Whiston, though he was called a Churchman, mixed much with Dissenters, and set up a form of service on his own favourite model of the Apostolical Constitutions. Catching the spirit of free inquiry which was in the wind, and looking to the quarter whence it blew, certain Dissenters, in the pleasant city of Exeter, proceeded to lengths further than were reached by some sympathetic brethren. A synod had been established there for purposes of truth and charity, and orthodox men, with a loving spirit, had guided its proceedings; but now, though orthodoxy remained with most of the members, the earliest concomitant temper had almost disappeared. When the ministers assembled on one occasion, as the people waited at the Meeting House door, to hear the usual lecture, it was agreed that each one should declare, in his own words, what he believed respecting the doctrine of the Trinity. Different expressions were employed, some distinct, some evasive; but at the close, the President pronounced the sense of the assembly to be, "That there is one living and true God, and that Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are one God." This did not allay contention. It was continued with increasing zeal and activity, and booksellers' shops in the cathedral city exhibited pamphlet after pamphlet

\* "Own Life," II 377.

in support of the new heresy. Trinitarianism, or Arianism in various degrees, was maintained by excited disputants ; and at length London engaged in the strife. Thomas Bradbury, a man of war in theology no less than politics, espoused the side of the Exeter Trinitarians, and sought to pledge on their behalf the Divines of the metropolis. A meeting was convened at Salters' Hall on the 19th of February, 1719. Calamy would not go. Watts and Neal also absented themselves. Watts, perhaps, did so from a retiring disposition ; and all three, it may be believed, cherished a wise conviction, that amidst the strife of tongues and the darkening vapours of prejudice and passion, the dove-like truth of God, the wisdom from above, both pure and peaceable, is not wont to light and rest on human hearts. But Bradbury felt himself in his element. After fierce debate, this disputant urged that all present should subscribe to the first Article of the Church of England on the doctrine of the Trinity, and also to the fifth and sixth answers of the Westminster Catechism. A crowd filled the little chapel ; and when the moment for decision arrived, amongst those who ascended the gallery to sign the roll, Bradbury stood conspicuous. Some below set up a hiss ; "It is the serpent's voice," cried the pastor of Fetter Lane, "and it may be expected against a zeal for Him who is the woman's seed." Those who refused to sign were Oldfield, an eminent Presbyterian tutor, and others of the same denomination, including Grosvenor, Chandler, and Lardner, who will all be noticed hereafter. They were joined by a few Baptists and Independents ; but most of the latter denomination followed Bradbury. The two divisions proceeded to offer the Exeter people "advices for peace." The non-subscribers' paper of

March the 10th, spoke soothingly and counselled moderation ; but whilst denying sympathy with Arian doctrine, they gave reasons for not signing the Trinitarian Confession. To do so, they said, would be taking a side in a party question, and was unnecessary for the purpose of clearing their orthodoxy, which had never been challenged. They affirmed that a declaration under such circumstances could never promote peace or truth ; and that the required subscription went beyond what was imposed in the Established Church. The subscribers' paper, of the 7th of April, was prefaced by their Declaration of Faith ; and they recommended, that the advice of neighbouring ministers should be sought, that it was proper for a Church to require a declaration of the pastor's faith, and that where attempts at union failed, different parties should quietly withdraw from each others' fellowship. The Salters' Hall controversy in some respects resembled the Bangorian ; like that, in the course of time, it gathered round it other questions ; like that, it saw pamphlets published in numbers one does not care to reckon ; like that, its records deserve to remain on dusty shelves ; and like that, it degenerated into disgraceful personalities. Charges of falsehood, inconsistency, and cowardice were bandied about, and scandals outside the doctrinal dispute were swept within the "dimpling eddies of the whirlpool." Calamy takes us further behind the scenes, and shows how much party spirit entered into this controversy ; how some Dissenters strove to involve Hoadly in the strife, "when he had not, at that time at least, discovered any great regard to them ;" and how the question of subscription, as agitated in the House of Commons just before, affected the dispute. Canvassing went on by the leaders of

the subscription party, to prevent the success of all attempts at declaring the terms of conformity; and Calamy adds that an orthodox Scotch Presbyterian, who was present at the Salters' Hall meeting, acknowledged "he never saw nor heard of such strange conduct and management before." \* The non-subscribers, on the whole, behaved more like gentlemen than did their opponents; but their antagonists, on account of their strongly expressed orthodoxy, won the sympathy of the Archbishop of Canterbury, who wrote to Bradbury, telling him, "I am glad to see that amidst our other much lesser differences, we all stand fast and agree in contending for the faith as it was once delivered to the saints. I hope we may no less agree in a true Christian love and charity towards one another. God, in His good time, make us perfect by bringing us to the same communion also." †

After this storm had spent its force, Calamy, in 1721, published some sermons preached in Salters' Hall at the lecture bearing its name; and though he scrupled to join Bradbury in his subscription, he on this occasion went in the service of orthodoxy as far as Bradbury himself could have gone; for he added four discourses, containing a vindication of the text in the first epistle of John, the fifth chapter and the seventh verse. The publication was intended to promote the Trinitarian cause, and to set the Doctor right with his brethren. Being a polite courtier, he dedicated his book to the King, comparing him to Charlemagne, the defender of the common faith, to whom Alcuin dedicated his treatise on the Trinity. Through Lord Townsend, he secured permission, not only to dedicate

\* See Dr. Calamy's "Historical Account," II. 401-418.

† Wilson's "Dissenting Churches," III. 521.

the volume, but also to present a copy of it to his Majesty. Whereupon he waited upon George I. "in his closet, between ten and eleven in the morning," and was highly gratified, when the King "graciously took it into his hands, and looked on it, and then was pleased to tell him he took the Dissenters for his hearty friends ;" he naïvely desired him, "to let them know, that in the approaching election of members of Parliament, he depended on them to use their influence, wherever they had any interest, in favour of such as were hearty for him and his family."\* The Presbyterian minister was informed by his Lordship that he would presently hear something from his brother, Robert Walpole. A few days later, Calamy presented another copy of the book to "the three young princesses," who "stood in a row before him," and said, in answer to his kind expressions, "Sir, we hope these good prayers will be continued, for which we shall be very thankful." Then came an answer from the Treasury, with a bill of fifty pounds, for which a receipt in form was required ; the accepter of the gift signed the paper "with humble thanks." In his simplicity, no doubt, he regarded it as a return for the book ; but also, no doubt, the King and his minister had intentions beyond rewarding the man of orthodoxy. To this incident there followed a grant from the Royal Bounty of £500, "for the use and behalf of the poor widows of dissenting ministers." Afterwards £500 was, "upon application made on that behalf, ordered to be paid each half-year for the assisting either *ministers or their widows*." The matter had to be kept secret, a circumstance which, of course, cast some suspicion over the business ; and though the gift

\* Calamy's "Own Life," II. 447.

fell into the hands of honourable men, some people persisted in looking at it as a bribe to secure Dissenters' votes. Such is the origin of the *Regium Donum*,\* which continued year after year to be handed over to certain leading Nonconformist ministers, who faithfully administered their trust, until the grant ceased in consequence of other grounds of objection than those which were started at first.

In 1722 Atterbury was still Bishop of Rochester and Dean of Westminster; but his fiery career then approached its end; nor was he longer to enjoy the society of Swift, Pope, and other celebrities within the precincts of his beloved Abbey. One August afternoon, whilst at the Deanery, after the Duke of Marlborough's funeral, he was, when sitting in his night gown, suddenly arrested, and conveyed in his own coach with great privacy, without any noise, "a prisoner to the Tower." Though the officers who seized him behaved with some respect, they searched for his papers, and threatened, if he did not speedily dress himself, they would take him away just as he was. On him, as a much-talked-of personage, loved by friends and hated by enemies, the Government, especially Walpole, had their eye, as too mischievous to be left at large. A Committee of the House of Commons investigated his case; and then charged him with treasonable correspondence to procure foreign troops for the restoration of the Stuarts. Some thought it the safest course to proceed against him, not before a jury, but by a Bill of pains and penalties. After the Bill had been introduced in the House of Commons the accused chose to make his defence when it reached the House

\* See the whole story (with a defence) in Calamy's "Own Life," II. 472.

of Lords. There his friend Lord Cowper delivered a speech, in which he insisted, that if there was legal evidence against the Bishop, he ought to be legally convicted; that to vote him guilty of high treason, without citing witnesses, and hearing him in his defence, was to make themselves both judges and accusers; and with some subtlety he proceeded to say, that by proceeding with the Bill and requiring the Royal assent to it, they were invading their own privileges, and violating the rights of the Crown. A party attack appeared in the cutting words, "I can guess at no advantage which the Church can derive from this Bill, except that it will cause a vacancy in the Deanery of Westminster and the See of Rochester." A sarcasm surpassed by one in Lord Bathurst's speech, "I can hardly account for the inveterate malice some persons bear to the learned and ingenious Bishop of Rochester, unless they are possessed of the infatuation of the wild Indians, who fondly believe, they will inherit, not only the spirit, but even the abilities, of any great enemy they kill." Atterbury made an eloquent defence, asking indignantly, How could it be possible for him to foment a conspiracy, while no one living knew when, where, and with whom, it was carried on? That he always lived at home, and, when in the Deanery, never stirred out of one room. His way in life, he declared, had not led him to be conversant with conspirators and with treason. "I have sat in chapters," he said, "in Convocations, in Parliament, but in a counsel of war I never sat, much less was at the head of it." He solemnly affirmed, on the faith of a Christian, and as with the last gasp of his breath, that he never knew of any methods taken to procure an insurrection.\* But the

\* See the whole speech in Atterbury's "Letters," II. 105, 180. His declaration of innocence is on pp. 178, 179.

Bill against him passed by a majority of 83 to 43, and the Bishop received a condemnation to banishment.

The trial and its results have been much criticised. Macaulay and Stanhope conclude that there is satisfactory evidence of Atterbury's treasonable designs. The latter is satisfied that the letters produced, said to be written by the Bishop, and on which the charge mainly rested, were genuine; on the other hand, this point is stoutly contested by a candid Church historian.\* It appears to me, that though the genuineness of the letters be probable, it is not certain; and that the evidence of their genuineness would not now satisfy an English jury. Moreover, there can be no doubt that the whole proceeding was an impolitic party move; and, as Lord Stanhope observes, "it set aside those ordinary forms, and those precious safeguards, which the law of treason enjoins—a violence of which the danger is not felt, only because the precedent has, happily, not been followed."† But Atterbury's complicity with plots under George's government to secure the restoration of the Stuarts, his sympathy with the rebellion, his correspondence with the Pretender, and his devotion to the Pretender's cause it is idle to deny; and these facts, read in connection with his asseverations of innocence, place his character in any but a favourable light. It is curious, after the lapse of so many years, that in 1864, a long closet in the Deanery was discovered behind the library fireplace, reached by a rude ladder, and capable of holding eight persons. Here, according to a vague tradition before the discovery, secret consultations of the kind alleged might have been held; and thus an answer is given to Atter-

\* Perry's "Ch. Hist.," III. Appendix.

† "Hist. of England," II. 49.

bury's famous question, as to *where* it was possible for the conspirators to meet.\*

After Atterbury's banishment, Walpole brought in a Bill to raise £10,000 a year by taxing the estates of Roman Catholics and Nonjurors. In the House of Lords the same nobleman who defended Atterbury appeared as the opponent of this persecuting measure. He implored their Lordships to inquire whether by passing it they would not injure Protestantism; for Protestants abroad might have to suffer for what was done by Protestants at home. He dwelt upon the disadvantages to a country, sure to follow such legislation; giving as an instance what happened to France through the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. Fifty-five Peers voted against a majority of sixty-nine; and Lord Cowper—it proved his last public act—entered his protest against the unrighteous Bill. Its impolicy was soon manifest. People, to escape the imposition of the tax, crowded to testify their allegiance, cursing the Government at the same time for the trouble it gave them; and Onslow, Speaker of the Commons, a calm looker-on, expressed his opinion, that "more real disaffection to the King and his family arose from it, than from anything which happened in that time."†

Following the occupants of the bench in chronological order, we meet with changes occurring in 1714, the year of the accession of George I. Hough was succeeded at Lichfield and Coventry by Edward Chandler, whose writings won for him a wide literary reputation, of which some other prelates were totally destitute. William Fleetwood, who wrote on coins and chronology—Queen Anne called him, "My Bishop,"—

\* Stanley's "Memorials of Westminster Abbey," 458.

† Coxe's "Memoirs of Sir Robert Walpole," II. 555.

was transferred from St. Asaph to Ely the same year ; but Her Majesty could not prevent her last Parliament from condemning one of Fleetwood's publications to be burnt by the hangman. In the same year Willis was called to a throne in the cathedral of Gloucester, vacated by the liberal Edward Fowler ; and George Smalridge proceeded to the diocese of Bristol, where he remained five years, and then died of apoplexy. A friend of Atterbury, and a High Churchman, he was nevertheless of such a pacific temper, that when he succeeded his pugnacious friend in his deaneries, he was said to carry a bucket to extinguish the flames kindled by his predecessor. Nor did this same changeful twelvemonth pass without another Episcopal elevation in the person of Francis Gastrell, who obtained the diocese of Chester, having before written on the Doctrine of the Trinity and other theological subjects. The next year, 1715, saw John Potter, the Greek Archæologist, and Regius Professor of Divinity, raised to the Bench. White Kennet, in 1718, succeeded Richard Cumberland, at Peterborough ; Hoadly rose from Bangor to Hereford in 1721, and from Hereford to Salisbury in 1723 ; and William Talbot was translated to Durham, in the intervening year. In 1723, Edmund Gibson was removed to London ; and the year afterwards, Launcelot Blackburne, who had succeeded Blackhall at Exeter in 1716, attained the post of the northern Primacy. Blackburne was succeeded at Exeter by Stephen Weston.

The age abounded in what were called “eminent Divines.” The appellation occurs continually in the notices of clergymen ; and there is a characteristic style of eulogy adopted, of which the following is a fair example. Speaking of Dr. Henry Brydges, the

writer says, "His demeanour was cheerful and humble, his manner sweet and unblamable, and his faith lively, firm, and orthodox; good-nature, compassion, generosity, and charity were visible in the whole course of his life and behaviour. He was a tender husband, an indulgent father, an affectionate brother, and a kind friend. He lived universally beloved, and died sincerely lamented."\* Stereotyped expressions of this order are employed in numerous cases; in fact, the language of epitaphs, from which no precise idea of character can be gathered, because the language employed is covered all over with a haze of partiality.

Though the Puritan stamp of religious sentiment had been transferred from the Established Church to Nonconformist Communities, yet the spirit of earlier times could scarcely have evaporated altogether in the parsonages of England. There must have been clergymen in the first quarter of the eighteenth century, who had been educated at Oxford and Cambridge in Cromwell's day; and surely some of them, without being exactly disciples of a Commonwealth professor, would retain a tone of religious feeling caught from their Alma Mater when under Puritan rule.

Clerical activity in one department of literature arose out of the Deistical Controversy. Several books on the Deistical side, to use a common contemporary expression, had made "a great noise." "The Amyntor" (1698), by John Toland, which proceeded upon principles drawn from Spincza,—though, according to a subsequent explanation, not designed as an attack on Christianity,—described the Canonical and Apocryphal Scriptures as having been originally on a level. The "Characteristics" of Lord Shaftesbury (1711), like the

\* Nicholls' "Literary Anecdotes," I. 206.

writings of Hobbes, assigned the determination of worship to the magistrate, attributed the Canon of Scripture to priestly artifice, stigmatized appeals to rewards and punishments as selfish, and insisted upon ridicule as a test of truth.. The "Discourse of Free Thinking" (1713), and "The Grounds and Reasons of the Christian Religion" (1724), from the pen of Anthony Collins, whilst referring to the gospel with respect, inveighed against the Clergy ; and made a specific attack on prophecy, saying that the whole proof of Christianity rested on the predictions of the Old Testament, which he laboured to show were fanciful and unfulfilled. Woolston's "Discourses on the Saviour's Miracles" (1727-1729), though, strange to say, professedly in defence of Christianity, attacked the Gospels as Gulliverian tales ; pronounced them allegorical, or deceptive, or capable of natural explanation. Tindal's "Christianity as Old as the Creation" (1730), took a different line from the rest, and dwelt upon natural religion and morality as evident from the beginning ; and upon what is called Revelation as *unnecessary and impossible*, following Lord Herbert in laying down fundamental principles sufficiently plain when read in the light of reason. Morgan published "The Moral Philosopher," in 1737.

Answers to these books were issued in abundance. Samuel Clarke, in 1699, Stephen Nye, in 1700, and John Richardson, the same year, wrote answers to Toland, in vindication of the canonical writings ; John Balguy, father of the Bishop of that name, replied to Lord Shaftesbury in 1729, taking up different parts of the "Characteristics;" Chandler, Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry, met the accusations and arguments of Collins in 1728, Smallbrook in 1729, and Pearce the

same year, also three or four others, grappled with Woolston; and Conybeare examined and refuted the reasonings of Tindal about the same time. Morgan was answered in 1737 by Hallet, and in 1739 by Chapman. These authors displayed learning and industry, and manifested zeal in the defence of religion. They pointed out the misrepresentations of their antagonists, unravelled their webs of sophistry, cleared up some difficulties they had discovered, and urged positive arguments in support of Scripture, chiefly of an historical kind. They spent much time and labour in exposing ignorance and prejudice on the side opposed to their own, which, after all, did not touch the core of the controversy; and one great defect in their methods of advocacy, is seen in failing to put clearly and in a convincing lustre the true difference between what is called *natural* and what is called *revealed* religion. Even Conybeare, whose "Defence of Revealed Religion" on the whole is the best, does but lightly touch on the pardon of sin, as a blessing offered by the gospel. The adaptation of the religion of Christ to the wants of humanity, its sins and its sorrows, its conflicts and its aspirations, seems to have been but dimly apprehended by these learned Divines. Certainly its crowning virtue and power are inadequately displayed. Dr. Samuel Clarke,—intellectually a much stronger man than any of the rest now named,—not only replied to "The Amyntor," but, being the most distinguished English metaphysician of his day, exhibited at an earlier period, 1705 and 1706, in his Boyle Lecture, an abstract "Demonstration of the Being and Attributes of God." His argument is by no means so original as some have supposed, since he is really found to have walked in the footsteps of

Cudworth, More, and Howe. Hoadly eulogized the work as "one regular building erected upon an immovable foundation, and rising up from one stage to another, with equal strength and dignity;" but Whiston, after reading it, showed the ingenious author a nettle in the garden, remarking that "the weed contained better arguments for the Being and Attributes of God than all his metaphysics."

Doctrinal controversies were added to the Deistical. Whiston contended that Christ is a Divine Person, created or begotten by the Father before all ages; that by Him He governs the world, but that He is inferior in nature and perfections; and that in the incarnation the Logos took the place of a human soul. Clarke, in his "*Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity*" (1712), laid down the principle that there is One supreme Cause and Original of things, and that with Him from the beginning was a second Person, not self-existing, but deriving His attributes from the Father. But he would not with the Arians affirm that "the Son was made out of nothing."<sup>\*</sup> And Waterland, in his "*Vindication of Christ's Divinity*" (1719), asserted and reasserted the Nicene faith against both Arians and Socinians.

A large number of inferior men followed in the wake of these great controversialists.

Owing to the writings of Whiston, Clarke, Waterland, and others, the doctrine of the Trinity was a topic especially attractive.<sup>†</sup> Clergymen read what was published by their masters, and enlisted themselves under

\* Dr. Clarke's "*Works*," IV.

† See "*Memoir of the Life and Writings of Dr. Waterland, being a summary view of the Trinitarian Controversy for twenty years, between the Doctor and a Clergyman in the country.*" (1736).

the flags of different regiments, using, with more or less skill, weapons provided by their leaders. Some were orthodox, some were heretical. They also talked on the subject at clerical meetings, and in the houses of parishioners, and failed not to discuss, with much or little learning, much or little ability, the books on divinity poured out from the press.

The Militant Church fought out this and other questions as for its life ; and while we read the writings of obscure polemics who shared in the encounter, we catch the war-cry of contending hosts, we hear the bray of brazen trumpets, and we witness the shock of internecine battle. In like manner, debates about Convocation and kindred topics, carried with them an immense amount of Church life, such as it was ; passionate, proud, selfish, also conscientiously earnest ; and honest partisans who could not think of religion apart from the Church,—and they were numerous,—of course felt that momentous issues were at stake. A remarkable instance of self-denying zeal in connection with the Convocational struggle, is found in the Biography of Samuel Wesley, who came up to London at great trouble and expense, and kept away from his family and his parish month after month, that he might at least give his vote on the side he espoused. And as we picture him walking through Westminster to Henry the Seventh's Chapel, and eagerly listening to debates led by Atterbury and Wake, perhaps joining in some of the Organ Room and Cloister struggles, what interest is involved in the remembrance that he had then at Epworth one who was to be the greatest of all modern masters in the service of song ; and a second, the founder of a Church, whose Conference should in religious influence outvie Convocation itself,

even in the Proctor's exaggerated estimate of its power. Besides all this, it must be remembered that in the reigns of Queen Anne and of the first George—especially during the excitement produced by the Rebellion of 1716—politics largely occupied the attention of the Clergy. Everywhere the claims of the Pretender and the Hanoverian succession was a subject of interest; and the talk in clubs, coffee houses, and private parlours found an echo in the pulpit. Parishioners came together on Sundays, eager to catch, according to their own sympathies, notes of loyalty or whisperings of rebellion; and many on each side found ample gratification. It is said that psalms were sometimes selected with a political meaning, and that under the guidance of a Jacobite Rector a congregation might be heard singing with fervour :—

“ Confounded be those rebels all  
That to usurpers bow,  
And make what gods and kings they please,  
And worship them below.”

Nor, while tongues were busy, were pens idle. Pamphlets followed up sermons, Tory and Whig clericals throwing themselves with the utmost ardour into the controversies waged by contending factions.

## CHAPTER XIX.

A FEW Dissenting worthies who had lived under the Stuarts remained in harness during the early part of the eighteenth century. Daniel Burgess is a conspicuous name. Born during the civil wars, and a Westminster boy in Busby's days, he entered the ministry in the reign of Charles II. "putting to sea," as he said, "in a storm, when very few Nonconformists did ;" and was committed to gaol at Marlborough on some frivolous charge, common in those times. Coming to London, he preached at an Independent meeting-house in Brydges Street, Covent Garden ; where, in the neighbourhood of the theatres, his singular mode of address attracted many of the actors, who made themselves merry at the expense of Dissenters. Burgess—proceeding on the maxim, "That's the best key which best fits the lock and opens the door, though it be not a silver or golden key"—indulged in a great many oddities, for which precedents may be found in the sermons of Latimer ; and according to a common story, he once said in coarse and offensive taste, yet not without a touch of truth, " If any of you would have a good and cheap suit, you will go to Monmouth Street ; if you want a suit for life, you will go to the Court of Chancery ; but if you wish for a suit which will last to eternity, you must go to the Lord

Jesus Christ, and put on His robe of righteousness.” \* After all, somebody who went to hear him on account of his eccentricities, returned remarking, “I never heard a better sermon in my life.” Burgess died in 1713, just before the accession of George I., exclaiming, as dark clouds lowered on Nonconformist prospects, “Well, if God has any more work for me, He can repair these decays, and will do it; and if not, blessed be God! I have a good home to go to, and this is a good time to go home.” At the same period passed away Joseph Stennett, an eminent Baptist, who occupied the pulpit of Pinners’ Hall, where he ministered to a congregation who believed in the observance of the seventh day, as binding upon Christians. The descendants of Stennett were scarcely less distinguished than himself; and his son and grandson prolonged the religious honour of the family down to the close of the century. Matthew Henry, after memorable service in the city of Chester, had undertaken in 1712, a new pastorate in the then rural parish of Hackney. There, very characteristically, he had commenced his work by expounding the first chapter of Genesis in the morning, and the first chapter of Matthew in the afternoon; but he could not have proceeded far in these discourses when, in 1714, on a journey to his old friends, he stopped at the salt town of Nantwich, and there died—with the beautiful words on his lips, addressed to a friend, “You have been used to take notice of the sayings of dying men: this is mine, that a life spent in the service of God, and communion with Him, is the most pleasant life that any one can live in this world.” Dr. Williams, already noticed, who founded the useful library in Grafton Street, died in 1716. His courteous demeanour and

\* Bogue and Bennett’s “History of Dissenters,” I. 482.

his considerable wealth, gave him a large amount of influence, which he steadily exercised on the side of truth and charity.

Five years afterwards, there followed to the grave in his forty-second year, an eminent member of the General Baptist denomination, John Gale, who had been educated at the University of Leyden, and at the age of nineteen had taken the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. He attained to literary renown, and enjoyed the friendship of Lord Chancellor King, Bishop Hoadly, and other distinguished persons. That which brought him most into public notice, was his work in reply to Wall's "History of Baptism." Extensive knowledge and sweetness of address "gave him easy access to men of the greatest figure and worth, by conversing with whom, his own abilities were much improved; and this advantage he constantly pursued. The large acquaintance he had with classic authors in both languages, and the progress he made in mathematical studies and in the most valuable parts of philosophy, were accompanied with a good degree of skill in the Oriental tongues."\* He ministered to a congregation in Paul's Alley, of which he remained pastor to the time of his death, in 1721. It is melancholy to add, as an illustration of the straitened circumstances of some ministers, that Gale left a widow and several children, who had to seek a livelihood by keeping a coffee shop in Finch Lane. Samuel Pomfret, driven away from London by persecution in the reign of Charles II., appears as pastor of a Church first meeting in Winchester Street and afterwards in Gravel Lane, Houndsditch. He once told a friend he had 800 communicants, and expected presently to receive

\* Funeral sermon, by Joseph Borroughs.

20 more. His temperament was excitable ; and we need not wonder at his popularity, when we read of his almost seraphic fervour. He died in 1722. In the same year departed Samuel Rosewell, pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Silver Street, of the same impassioned spiritual nature as his brother Pomfret. He could talk of Stuart times with vivid recollections and startling effect ; for he had stood at the bar before Judge Jeffries, to answer an absurd charge of treason. Ordained in 1705, he succeeded John Howe, but removed in the latter years of his life to Hackney ; there he was visited by Watts, who in a funeral sermon describes the interview. "Come, my friends," he exclaimed, "come into the chamber of a dying Christian ; come, approach his pillow, and hear his holy language : 'I am going up to heaven, and I long to be gone—to be where my Saviour is. Why are His chariot wheels so long in coming ? I hope I am a sincere Christian, but the meanest and the most unworthy. I know I am a great sinner, but did not Christ come to save the chief of sinners ? I have trusted in Him, and I have strong consolation. I love God ; I love Christ. I desire to love Him more, to be more like Him, and to serve Him in heaven without sin. Dear brother, I shall see you at the right hand of Christ. There I shall see our friends who are gone a little before (alluding to Sir. T. Abney). I go to my God and to your God—to my Saviour, and to your Saviour.' " Edmund Calamy lived till 1732, and, from what I have already recorded, will be seen to have been in his day a guiding spirit amongst Presbyterians and Nonconformists in general. A pastoral life of forty years ended in a solemn discourse from the words, "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all," a

discourse in keeping with the spirit of the preacher's text, and of the preacher's life. His conspicuous position and courtly manners, brought him into contact with persons holding high office in Church and State. Sometimes with amusing frankness he relates his interviews with them, not attempting to conceal the gratification he experienced. He repeats the heads of a conversation which he and Benjamin Robinson held with Burnet, "at his lodgings in St. James's House," where he was encouraged "to some free discourse," by "his Lordship's former civilities." The report of a subsequent conversation closes with the remark that "it might answer very good ends for some of us sometimes to wait on great men that would admit us to freedom of intercourse upon critical exigences." With the statesmen of the day he occasionally held conferences, as appears from his autobiography.\*

Isaac Watts, celebrated in three departments of English literature—poetry, Divinity, and metaphysics—became pastor of an Independent Church in the year 1704, and remained, nominally at least, in that office down to the time of his death. His father had been imprisoned for Nonconformity, and it is said that at the prison door, in the town of Southampton, where Isaac was born in the year 1674, his mother had sometimes seated herself on a stone to nurse the babe of promise. He was educated for the Nonconformist ministry in the Academy on Newington Green established by Charles Morton, and afterwards conducted by Thomas Rowe; and his exercises there betokened his subsequent attainments in philosophical Divinity, whilst his irrepressible genius for versification made itself

\* "Own Life," I. 467.

manifest. He preached his first sermon in 1698, and for a time assisted Dr. Chauncy in his ministerial labours at Mark Lane. The memory of his father, with connected family traditions, would serve to deepen those convictions in favour of Dissent which were founded upon a course of study and reflection; but though a decided Nonconformist, he was a man of charity and peace, delighting to associate with members of other denominations besides his own. He reckoned amongst his friends distinguished personages in Church and State. Amongst his correspondents were Gibson, Bishop of London, Lord Barrington, and the Countess of Hertford. Several letters from this lady occur in Watts' life, and from them we learn that she entrusted him with her poetical compositions. According to the fashion of the age, she selected "Eusebia" as her literary cognomen, whilst Mrs. Rowe—a common friend of her ladyship and the Nonconformist poet—was addressed by the name of Philomela—the Countess at the same time somewhat amusingly communicating with him as an authority about the education of her son, Lord Beauchamp.\* At times Watts' nervousness was very great, though stories of it told by anxious friends were much exaggerated; for it appears, from the testimony of those who knew him best, that though dejected and absent, enfeebled in action and unfitted for work, he never fell into a state of derangement. At a time when his faculties were in the utmost vigour, he indulged in certain speculations which deviated from the orthodox line, yet by no means so as to render his faith as a Christian at all questionable, or to give the slightest countenance to the report that he was labouring under an aberration of mind. In his "Christian

\* Milner's "Life of Watts."

Doctrine of the Trinity," he simply asserted that there are Three Persons and one God; but in "Dissertations," in two parts, published soon afterwards, he broached a theory to the effect, that Christ's human soul was the first of all creatures, formed before the foundation of the world, and immediately united to the Divine nature. This idea, akin to one expressed by Origen, he propounded for the purpose of meeting Arian objections to orthodox opinions, on the ground that they involve the assertion of change in an Infinite and therefore Unchangeable Nature. According to Watts' hypothesis, the change implied in the humiliation of the Son of God pertained to His human, not His Divine nature. He further believed that the sentiments of ancient Jews and Christians favoured the notion of a twofold Logos, or, of the Word of God having a double nature, human as well as Divine, before the Incarnation. Watts's mind was of the speculative order, and in other fields he allowed himself to expatiate. As a Dissenter, he of course objected to the existing Establishment, but he was far from apprehending those principles which lie at the basis of modern Voluntaryism. As political theories and abstract conceptions of government floated in men's minds, and had a great charm for the reading public, he caught the spirit of the times, and, musing in Lady Abney's gardens at Theobalds and Newington, he sketched a Utopian and impracticable state of society in "A New Essay on Civil Power in Things Sacred." He considered it to be the duty of rulers to promote the interests of religion in a general way—to inculcate moral duties upon the people at large, and to institute devotional services in connection with national mercies and calamities; but, he said, no *particular* form of

religion ought to be established and paid for out of the exchequer of the State. That, he thought, should be left free for individuals to choose, according to their own convictions ; “the phantom of a universal conscience given to the Government” being by him pronounced “a sorry pretence and big with absurdities.” He maintained that all which particular Churches can claim is protection against disturbance by “men of violence, or harlequins and scaramouches,” or by other intruders ; and all exclusion of the members of such Churches from civil offices he declared to be thoroughly unjust. He remarked that advantages may accrue to the State, and also to the Church, by a certain connection between them, without any such alliance as some supposed necessary ; but advances of this sort on either side, he said, should be carefully guarded, as the Church is in danger of losing its humility, and the State its freedom, by such complications.

The books in which these theological and ecclesiastical views are embalmed, secure now but few readers, and Watts’ metaphysical disquisitions are seldom taken down from the library shelf ; but his name is deeply engraven on the history of our literature, and finds a cherished place in the memories of Christian Englishmen. His “Divine Songs” interested us in the nursery ; and his psalms and hymns, sung in every Protestant Church within the British dominions and the United States, are vastly superior to anything of the kind previously existing in the English language. Watts, really a poet, was the first to express the spirit of the psalter in harmonious verse, and in application to New Testament times—in this respect surpassing Milton ;—and his hymns, though some of them are

carelessly composed, present specimens of admirable versification, and of impassioned devotional sentiment.

Watts survived George I.; but as the latter part of his life was spent in retirement, I may here anticipate his closing days. Some relatives assailed his character, a circumstance which, as it never touched his reputation because the assaults were malicious, may be left in oblivion; but his depression towards the end was so intense as greatly to pain his numerous friends. "When he was almost worn out by his infirmities," we are told, "he observed, in conversation with a friend, that he remembered an aged minister used to say that the most learned and knowing Christians, when they come to die, have only the same plain promises of the Gospel for their support as the common and unlearned; 'and so,' said he, 'I find it. It is the plain promises, that do not require much labour and pains to understand them; for I can do nothing now but look into my Bible for some promise to support me, and live upon that.' He discoursed much of his dependence upon the atoning sacrifice of Christ; and his trust in God, through the Mediator, remained unshaken to the last. 'I should be glad,' he said, 'to read more, yet not in order to be confirmed more in the truth of the Christian religion, or in the truth of its promises; for I believe them enough to venture an eternity on them.'" He died in December, 1748, and was buried in Bunhill Fields, his funeral being attended, at his own desire, by two Independents, two Presbyterians, and two Baptists.

Next may be mentioned two Nonconformists, to whom fame has done scant justice. Simon Browne, minister for a while in the Old Jewry, where he had crowded congregations, retired from public life, heart-

broken with domestic bereavement, and sunk into a strange state of delusion, believing that his soul was annihilated, and that he had become utterly divested of consciousness. It was while in such a mysterious state that he wrote a reply to Woolston and Tindal. It is to his credit that he repudiated all aid from the magistrate in this controversy, for in his preface of a "Fit Rebuke to a Ludicrous Infidel" (1732), he asserts the fullest liberty of conscience, and condemns civil prosecutions in matters of religious opinion. Jeremiah Jones, minister of a Dissenting congregation in Gloucestershire, is to be ranked with Browne amongst the able literary defenders of Christianity ; he wrote "A Vindication of the Gospel of St. Matthew" from Whiston's charge of dislocation, maintaining that our present Greek copies of it are in the same order in which they were originally written ; and "A New and Full Method of Settling the Canonical Authority of the New Testament." The latter work is one of distinguished research ; whilst breaking ground in a new department of critical inquiry, it still retains its place as a principal authority, awaiting the labours of modern scholars in a field of research where much work remains to be done. Jeremiah Jones had studied under Samuel Jones of Tewkesbury and Gloucester. After a short ministry at Nailsworth, in Gloucestershire, he died in 1724, aged only thirty-one. The good man sleeps amidst the charming Cotswold scenery, in a burial ground called Forest Green, a cleared space in the heart of ancient woods, where Nonconformists in days of persecution had been wont to meet for Divine worship.

Passing from Nonconformist preachers to Nonconformist preaching, it is obvious that no general remarks will apply to the varieties which that preaching pre-

sents. A distinction must be made between its substance and its form. As to its substance, it has been said, that a great change began to take place in it, inasmuch as preachers came more and more to see that Christianity rests on moral, rather than supernatural grounds, and that this committed them to new paths of thought, which led eventually to latitudinarian views. Where this habit existed by itself, it tended in the long run to a great theological revolution. But it is forgotten, that some who placed Christianity on a moral foundation rather than any other, also held so firmly to the authority of Scripture, and continued to interpret it so much in the old Puritan spirit, that they really diverged very little from what is understood by Evangelical teaching. One principle in their minds so modified the operation of another, that what some would deem the necessary logical result, did not follow in actual life. Many continued to rest Christianity entirely upon the old foundation, and closely to walk in the footsteps of their predecessors. The theology of Bradbury, and he represents a large class, was all but identical with that of Owen and Goodwin.

As to the form of preaching, however unlike it might be to models of the former century, though there were fewer divisions, less of precise dogmatism, and more of polish in expression, still there may be found in the sermons of Calamy and Watts, considerable formality in the distribution of topics, combined with a tone of appeal, and a closeness of application, quite after the manner of Baxter and Howe. Much of the fire and force of a previous age had died out; but a good deal of that *unction* which gave a charm to the best preachers of the Commonwealth continued still. And it ought to be stated, that whatever speculations might be

entertained as to the nature of Christ, and His relation to the Father, Dissenters generally continued to insist upon His gracious meditation and redemptive work. They set forth *Him*, as the Way, the Truth, and the Life. Whatever of Arianism or of Unitarianism there might be in the West, few if any of the ministers assembled at Salters' Hall were in sympathy with such opinions. A large minority subscribed to the orthodox confession ; and the majority who did not adopt that course alleged as a reason, that their orthodoxy had not been called in question.

After the Toleration Act had passed, little confidence was felt in the permanent security of Nonconformist liberties, and congregations slowly emerged from barns and cottages, to rear for themselves convenient structures in public thoroughfares. The name they gave to what they built is significant. The present age of ecclesiastical architecture was then lying in the remote distance ; few, if any, Presbyterians, Independents, or Baptists would have thought of choosing the name *church* for the structure in which they assembled, since that, in their estimation, would be to confound the spiritual with the material, the people with the place. As to the word *chapel*, so universal some years ago, our fathers, except in cases of historical association, rarely used the term ; perhaps to them it savoured of Prelacy and Popery. *Meeting*, or *Meeting-house*, was the orthodox designation.

In the Metropolis, and throughout the country, as in the Establishment, so within the borders of Dissent, the reign of the first George saw extensive building operations going on for religious purposes. After Watts had officiated in an old building as pastor of a church established by Dr. Owen, a new

meeting-house was built for him, in St. Mary Axe, a district which had even then lost the associations woven around it in earlier days by the contiguity of Duke's Place, where the House of Norfolk dwelt, in almost regal splendour, under Queen Elizabeth. The cost was £700 ; and, according to the contract, the dimensions were forty feet in front, and fifty in depth. It stood on leasehold ground, for which a rent of £20 a year was paid. The Bishop of London granted a licence dated October 6, 1708. A plan of the building was drawn for the information of persons to whom seats were allotted ; the subscription list is still preserved, and amongst other documents connected with the Trust, this memorandum appears : "That the use of one or more places in a particular seat is assigned to them for their conveniency in public worship during their personal attendance there ; and if they die or absent themselves above six months, their interest therein is to be void and fall into the hands of the Trustees."

Lancashire had been a land of Goshen for the Presbyterians ; and in it they remained a numerous body, throughout the age of persecution. When that ceased, they left their concealment, and began to build places of worship in the best situations they could find. In Manchester, "a great and fair meeting-house" had been opened in 1704, amidst "the curses and reproaches" of the Jacobite populace. In the neighbourhood we meet with stone-masons, bricklayers, and carpenters busy in carrying out specifications laid down by Nonconformist committees. Copious details remain of what was done in erecting a meeting-house at Birch, about the beginning of the last century, after a former "chapel" had been restored to the Fellows and

Wardens of the Collegiate Church. The new building must have been a humble one, as it cost under £100 ; and it is curious to discover that for "the pulpitt quishion," as it is called, was paid the disproportionate sum of £1 3*s.* 3*d.* Still more curious is it to read the description of the property, in the conveyance deed, as the said "edifice, *chapel*, oratory, and meeting-place," one of these designations, no doubt, being borrowed from Birch Chapel, which the good folks had just left. The Trust deed required that the pulpit should be occupied by "a Protestant able minister, who is of the Presbyterian judgment and practice, as to Church discipline and government, and not of any other persuasion ; that he should be orthodox and sound in the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, and hold and profess the doctrinal Articles of the Church of England." Sittings were appropriated to the family of the Worsleys and their servants. Near Blackburn a meeting-house was built in 1710, where two pews were appropriated to the Houghton family with their servants. In the same year a commodious place of worship was erected at St. Helens. As to Liverpool, a town which only began to appear on the map of England about the middle of the seventeenth century, we read of "the house of Mr. Daniel Fabiens, practizer in physic," being licensed at the Quarter Sessions, July 25, 1700, for the use of the Baptists ; and of a meeting-house in Kaye Street, 1710, for the use of the Presbyterians.

In Yorkshire, the favoured region of "Old Dissent," Morley Chapel, once included within the Establishment, remained in Nonconformist hands ; and in 1691, at Leeds, the congregation in Catt Lane constructed what is described as "a stately chapel or meeting-house, with a turret on the leaded roof." In 1718, a

new edifice appears in the town of Bradford, at the cost of £340, of which the furniture had been brought from the dismantled chambers of Howley Hall. And in the Eastern Counties, we still meet, at Norwich, with a place of worship remaining much as it was when opened—with dark oak gallery and pulpit, columns supporting the roof, and monuments and hatchments, several of early date, adorning the walls. On entering such edifices your attention would be attracted by the pulpit, either a good large platform enclosed by wainscot sides, with a curved projection in front supporting a book-board, or a deep narrow box, such as, until of late, was common in country churches, surmounted by a heavy sounding-board. Occasionally above this piece of furniture might be espied a dove with an olive-branch in its mouth, the only emblem allowed in a Puritan edifice. On the back board, above the preacher, there was sometimes a nail or peg, on which to hang a clerical hat, perhaps, after a funeral, draped with a long silk band. Occasionally, a desk for the precentor or clerk stood under the pulpit ; and in front was almost always placed a table pew, as it was called, a large square or oblong enclosure, containing a seat running all round, with the Communion Table in the middle. It was to the meeting-house, what an altar is at church ; only, from it all sacerdotal ideas were kept at a distance. On “the table” there would often be a Bible, less frequently “Foxe’s Book of Martyrs,” or a folio volume of sermons ; a provision not dissimilar to the old practice of chaining the Scriptures, or the Martyrology, to some conspicuous part of a parish church. The poor generally occupied the surrounding benches ; and at the administration of the Lord’s Supper they removed to give place to the

deacons and to the pastor. No font could be found within the four blank and dimly-lighted walls ; a basin, in some instances carried up to the side of the pulpit, where a ring had been fixed to receive it, served for the purpose of holy baptism. The principal pews were spacious, like parlours ; and those appropriated to rich men resembled such as are appropriated in a country church to the squire of the parish. They were lined with green baize, and were often concealed behind thick curtains, whilst on the door, in a few distinguished instances, was carved either a monogram or a family crest. Two or three large brass chandeliers were in numerous cases suspended from the ceiling by a chain ; and with their few candles they gave, in the late hour of a winter's afternoon, just light enough to make darkness visible. Evening services at that period were unusual, save on some very special occasion. In the front gallery, or in the table pew to the exclusion of the poor, there would be singing men and singing women to lead the psalmody ; and by no means in all cases did they stand when engaged in the service of song. The practice of dividing the congregation according to sex is a custom which lingered in country meeting-houses within my own remembrance — a practice now introduced into High Churches according to primitive custom.

The congregations occupying these edifices were for the most part poor ; yet a few aristocratic families, who had been Presbyterians or Independents during the Commonwealth, preserved their ancestral faith. Amongst the members at Bury Street are the names of Lady or Dame Abney, Watts' friend ; and the equally well known Sir John Hartopp ; also the eccentric granddaughter of Oliver Cromwell, Bridget

Bendish, of whom curious stories are told, and who is said to have resembled her illustrious ancestor. The name of Ashurst appears on the Church list ; but what is a little strange, no distinguished name except Sir John Hartopp's is found on the original list of subscribers to the new building, and he gave £20, the largest donation of any except one of £30 by a Mr. Punkard, perhaps a City merchant.

The mode of receiving communicants, or, as it was termed, "admitting members to the Church," varied in different denominations. The Baptists were very strict ; even requiring that candidates should give expression to their religious experience, and explain how they were converted. The Independents were rather less rigid, in some cases dispensing with any requirement of the kind, but they demanded assent, in some way, to articles of faith, and to the old Church covenant preserved in their ecclesiastical records. The Presbyterians entered into no spiritual scrutiny, and asked for no theological confession.

After public service, comprising a long extempore prayer, the reading of Scripture, a sermon, and psalmody, the Baptists now adopting the latter practice, there came the Communion of the Lord's Supper, frequently in the afternoon, when the general congregation retired, and "the doors were shut." Conscientiously adhering to the Master's example, who "*sat down* with the twelve," and inadvertently adopting an ancient practice—manifested in Italian churches, by the position of the Bishop's chair *behind* the altar, and the Presbyters' seats ranged on either side—the Nonconformist Bishop of the eighteenth century seated himself at the end or side of a long table, with the elders or deacons on the right hand and the left. The table was

covered with a fair linen cloth, on which were placed, when the church was large, two flagons with cups and plates, the flagons filled with wine, and the plates containing bread, being sometimes made of silver. The pastor began by reading the Words of Institution, prefacing them, perhaps, with a short address ; then he proceeded to break bread, to "give thanks," and to repeat the solemn declaration of the Saviour, "This is My body which was broken for you." The elders or deacons took round the bread to the communicants who occupied the pews ; and the pastor poured out the wine and again gave thanks, after which he repeated the further declaration, "This is the cup of the new testament in My blood, which was shed for many for the remission of sins." During the distribution of the "elements" there was profound silence, and at the close, "when they had sung a hymn," they contributed to the offertory or collection and parted, with the Divine blessing pronounced by the president.

The choice of the minister being a grave matter, the people had a day of fasting and prayer for Divine direction. A candidate was invited to preach, and if approved, in some cases, he was first received into communion, by dismissal from the Church he had left, and then chosen to the pastorate, after which, by further fasting and prayer, he was solemnly set apart to the pastoral charge, neighbouring ministers being generally invited to take part in a service on the occasion. Such was the Baptist and Congregational practice ; the Presbyterian method differed a little, the people doing less and the neighbouring ministers doing more, both in the choice and the ordination. The laying on of hands was customary with most, if not all the denominations. How they behaved to a minister after they

had chosen him, depended on the disposition of both parties, and on a variety of circumstances. Instances of strife, jealousy, and painful separation occurred ; but numerous instances of a far different kind are recorded in old Church books, and in Nonconformist history. Incomes were commonly small, for Watts and his successor received only about £100 a year. In the country, salaries were much less, and had to be eked out by contributions from Trusts, instituted, like Queen Anne's Bounty, in aid of poor benefices. A new pastor received a warm welcome, and there are Church books containing entries to the effect that a deputation had been despatched to meet him on his way ; and exuberant kindness and reverential attention would go so far as to send a coach and four to conduct the elect and his family to their destined home. So far from Nonconformity in those days being a levelling system, we are informed of a Presbyterian minister, that " he had high notions of the ministerial power, and thought that it was derived from the Apostles, who had their commission from Christ : so that his opinion was, that Christ had granted a charter, that was his word, by virtue of which all ministers had power to rule and act in the Church, as such, at all times and upon all occasions."\* Many Churches, with all their democratic theories, practically acted on that opinion.

Dissenting academies continued to be boarding-schools for the education both of ministers and laymen. Many of the pupils were young ; and instruction was imparted by the principal, aided perhaps by an assistant or two. Newington Green could, at the opening of the eighteenth century, boast of more than one establishment of this description ; but they had no permanent

\* See Murch's "Presbyterian Churches," 501.

foundation, and therefore soon disappeared, as tutors died or removed. We can distinctly trace the removal of Dr. Oldfield from Newington to Hoxton ; but soon afterwards he vanishes ; what became of his academy I cannot tell. Also Dr. Ridgley—author of an elaborate and tedious “System of Divinity,” not wanting in acuteness, but quite unsuited to modern habit of thought, though once in high Nonconformist repute—carried on during his London ministry a course of education for the ministry, assisted by John James, F.R.S., a friend of Sir Isaac Newton, and an ingenious scholar, educated at Merchant Taylors’ School. In the city of Gloucester there resided Samuel Jones, already noticed. Secker, as a youth, wrote a letter praising Jones’ Academy, in which he was educated, as “an extraordinary place of education.” He speaks of his tutor in the highest terms, as preserving his pupils from negligence and immorality ; and we find that they studied logic as well as Greek and Latin, plunged into Jewish antiquities and attacked Hebrew, the Talmud, Masora, and Cabala. On Wednesdays they read Dionysius’ “Periegesis” with “notes mostly geographical ;” and Isocrates and Terence were conned twice a week. The boys, says the young correspondent, rose at five o’clock every morning, and always spoke Latin, “except when below stairs amongst the family.” “We pass our time very agreeably.”\*

It is unnecessary, and it would be difficult to trace the obscure history of seminaries at Shrewsbury and Attercliffe ; and in the West of England, at Exeter, Tiverton, Bridgewater, Colyton ; but it is important to remark, that the large number of schools both for ministers and laymen, scattered over the country, in-

\* Bogue and Bennett’s “History,” II. 347-350.

dicate desires for an educated ministry, and illustrate efforts to supply the want of University culture, from which Nonconformists were cut off. Also the facts recited place in a melancholy light the tendency of the Schism Act, which, if not repealed, would have extinguished these flickering lights up and down the land, and consigned Dissent to the depths of ignorance. As it was, with all the mitigations which followed, men who devoted themselves to these labours suffered frequent interruptions from the intolerant spirit which lurked in many quarters.

General Assemblies of Baptist Churches had been held in the seventeenth century ; but the distance between one Church and another in the provinces had occasioned much inconvenience, consequently it was determined to form local associations, and we find them assembling in the reign of Anne and George I.\* From these associations it might be supposed that the Baptist ministers and Churches at large were alike in theological sentiment, and acted in unison with one another ; but this was not the case. The question of open and strict communion still continued, so also did the deeper question as to Arminian and Calvinistic views. For some time, however, the line of distinction does not seem to have been deeply marked. In the meetings just referred to, though some present were Particular Baptists, it does not appear that all were so ; and a Baptist pastor, writing in the year 1717, speaks of Churches which did not like to be called by either of these names, some agreeing in part with Arminianism, and in part with Calvinism. He mentions as a fact, that Churches which had before borne these different appellations, were now blended into one, and

\* See Crossby's and Ivimey's Histories of the Baptists.

cites examples of London Churches whose members were partly of one opinion and partly of another. Ministers, too, after having presided over General Baptists, were elected by Particular Baptists, but this might arise from a change in their theological sentiments. At all events, for a time the distinction between the two parties seems to have been by no means sharp ; but it became sharp enough afterwards. The Particular Baptists did not decline from orthodoxy, as did the General Baptists, many of whom, especially in the West of England, were caught within the current of free inquiry, and proceeded from Trinitarianism to Arianism, and from Arianism to Socinianism. The latter being thus in a state of transition, it was to be expected that varieties of opinion would prevail among them. Some of the distinctions were such as could scarcely be conjectured apart from historical facts. One division was based upon the maintenance of the six principles enumerated in the Epistle to the Hebrews, the foundation of repentance from dead works, faith towards God, the doctrine of Baptism, of laying on of hands, of the resurrection of the dead, and of final judgment. The laying on of hands came to be in this division an important point. A General Baptist Church in White's Alley, formed in the Revolution year, 1688, would on no account omit the practice of laying on hands in connection with baptism. So tenacious were the brethren in this matter, that when their pastor expressed doubts respecting it, they united with other Churches of the same opinion in suspending him from office.

In reference to the social life of Dissenters, it may be observed, that in the West of England, at Exeter for instance, Nonconformists were numerous and power-

ful, comprising some of the wealthiest citizens ; and in Lancashire, Yorkshire, and the Eastern Counties, indeed wherever homes of industrial activity were found, Dissenters, like the Huguenots, were sure to prosper. Their habits helped them in this respect ; and perhaps in the end, when they became rich, and could keep a coach, they left the conventicle for the parish church. Some in the higher walks of life retained Nonconformist principles and adorned them by their domestic and social habits. In Dame Abney's family Lord's days were devoutly observed. Worship morning and evening was maintained, and there might be a little Puritan strictness in the government of her servants, whilst she won their affection by her unfeigned sympathies. "She opened her mouth with wisdom, and in her tongue was the law of kindness." She had a daughter, Sarah Abney, who died long before her mother ; and respecting her, Dr. Watts, in a style characteristic of Nonconformists at that time, remarked in a funeral sermon preached for her at Theobalds in 1732, "Nor did she forbid all the polite diversions of youth agreeable to her rank, nor did reason, or religion, or her superior relatives forbid her ; yet she was still awake to secure all that belongs to honour and virtue, nor did she use to venture to the utmost bounds of what sobriety and religion might allow." "Dame Sarah," as her minister tells us, "kept her worldly accounts all written fair with her own hand in a very regular method ; and as she had large resources, she abounded in the graces of charity." "It may be truly said of her, as it was of Dorcas, that she was full of good works and alms deeds which she did." "Abney Park Cemetery," as it is called by some ; "The Dissenters' Necropolis," as it is termed by others, covers the site

of the mansion and gardens where Dame Mary sometimes lived after her husband's death. The house was in its prime during the reign of George I., full of quaint and somewhat cumbrous furniture, and compassed about, in the garden portion of the territory, with noble trees and primly cut shrubs, and box-bordered beds of tulips and roses, and sundry old-fashioned flowers, cultivated according to the most approved taste of Dutch gardening. There she provided for the comfort of Watts through all his days of affliction. "Madam," said he to a noble lady who called to see him, "you are come on a very memorable day." "Why so remarkable?" she asked. "This day thirty years," replied the invalid, "I came hither to the house of my good friend, Sir Thomas Abney, intending to spend but one single week under his friendly roof; and I have extended my visit to the length of exactly thirty years." "Sir," added Dame Mary, "what you have termed a long thirty years' visit, I consider as the shortest visit my family ever received." Watts was domestic chaplain. Morning and evening he led the devotions of the household, and on Sunday night preached to the family. Two discourses delivered, not at Newington, but at Theobalds, are inserted in the first volume of his sermons, under the title of "Appearance before God;" and we can picture the thoughtful conductor of the service, with pale face and bent figure, but with piercing eye and distinct though feeble voice, slowly and impressively unfolding his subject to the great delight of the good dame, her children and visitors; while coachmen and footmen and other servants were sitting round the hall, not inattentive to the man whose gentle ways won their hearts and inspired their sympathy and love.

In merchants' dwellings and tradesmen's shops, in manor houses and country farms, the primitive life of the former century might still be found, with such modifications as time is sure to make in old customs and habits. Still there was strict "Sabbath" observance, and domestic worship, and reading of expositions and daily order; with abstinence from fashionable amusements, yet with no lack of innocent recreation. Traditions of what had been done and suffered under Charles and James were carefully preserved, much to the confirmation of Dissent through a hatred of religious oppression. Baptisms, marriages, and funerals went on as usual; the first administered by Nonconformist pastors, the last conducted also by them, where burial grounds were attached to meeting-houses, or where the objectionable practice existed of burying the dead under the pulpit or in the aisles. Marriages could not be celebrated by Dissenting ministers; for the legal sanction and for the ecclesiastical blessing of the nuptial rite, Nonconformists had to go to Church.

Touching the statistics of Dissent, Defoe, in 1702, reckoned Nonconformists altogether at two millions.\* Another census, drawn up in 1715 by Daniel Neal, author of "The History of the Puritans," shows that there were then in Middlesex ninety-one congregations, including twenty-six of the Baptist denomination. The total throughout England amounted to 1107, of which 247 were Baptists. In North and South Wales returns were made of only forty-three. The Presbyterians formed a large majority, though Independents had increased; the Baptists remaining the least numerous of the three divisions. At the end of the third decade of the century misgivings arose amongst

\* Wilson's "Life of Defoe," II. 48.

Dissenters as to the state of their affairs. Complaints were made that the Churches had declined both in numbers and in spiritual efficiency. A publication appeared entitled "An Inquiry into the Causes of the Decay of the Dissenting Interest," in which the author questioned the assumption, noticing that several metropolitan congregations had risen to prosperity, though others had sunk into feebleness. This inquirer complained that orthodox Divines in many cases were bigoted ; that sermons were too long ; that prayers were too short ; that youths were put to High Church schools ; that encouragement was afforded to strolling Scotch ministers ; that vacant pulpits were mismanaged ; and that older ministers did not properly treat their younger brethren. As one great remedy, the writer suggested that Dissenting preachers should cultivate polite habits. Philip Doddridge, then a young man, published a reply, entitled "Free Thoughts on the Best Means of Reviving the Dissenting Interest." He peeled off the rind and reached the core. "We are concerned," he says, "for this interest, not merely as the cause of a distinct party, but of truth, honour, and liberty ; and I will add, in a great measure the cause of serious piety too." His idea seems to have been that the decline of Nonconformity, so far as it obtained, arose from spiritual declension amongst its professors ; and one remedy he urged was a strain of preaching not dryly orthodox, but full of earnestness and unction, evangelical in spirit as well as opinion, and adapted to the popular mind of the age.

"A person who came from Northampton, to reside in London," availed himself of the opportunities afforded to inquire into the state of metropolitan Churches, and has left behind a curious record of the

results, dated 1731.\* He takes notice of the preachers of the day, not exactly in the sensational style now so prevalent; but yet in a way which indicates partiality and prejudice, and prevents us from placing implicit confidence in his statements. He reports that there were resident in London seventy-four Presbyterian and Independent ministers, and one congregation which he denominates the "*Loggerheads*," whoever they might be. In Southwark there were ten meeting-houses with large congregations; Gravel Lane was occupied by Dr. Marriott, whose "public compositions were judicious and valuable," but wanting an "agreeable delivery." The minister of Deadman's Place was Mr. Killingham, "a, warm Calvinist, and of a warm natural disposition, which spirit promoted his falling out with his people." Mr. Read, of St. Thomas's, was "a serious preacher but in sentiments only of the middle way." Horsely Down "had the largest auditory in Southwark;" and the minister was a person of "great life and vivacity;" and, adds the honest critic, "could he think closely and behave with a more becoming gravity, he would be much more considerable." Mr. Benson in St. John's Court, had just arrived from Abingdon, which he had left "because his people would not swallow down Arminianism." The sentiments of the Jamaica Row preacher were "not as agreeable as his gifts;" and the Lower Rotherhithe pastor had "good pulpit talents, but too great an opinion of himself." This gentleman walked over to Stepney Meeting House, with "the green," and a pleasant country round about. His mind was full of the memory of Matthew Mead, who, he said, so pleaded the cause of Christ's poor, that, at

\* This document is preserved in Dr. Williams' Library, Grafton Street.

Pinners' Hall once, he obtained a collection of £300; ladies not provided to give in proportion to this stirring appeal, "pawned their watches and rings as pledges till they redeemed them;" but when our informant heard the pastor who at this visit occupied the pulpit, he could not speak of him as he did of the Puritan celebrity. "Although Mr. Hubbard," he remarks, "is a laborious and affectionate preacher, yet it is accounted that the interest of this Church is much declining." The minister in Goodman's Fields had "no small courage and boldness;" but he who presided at Petticoat Lane, Whitechapel, "had very little learning, and was very little polished, yet had been the instrument of good to many." Bethnal Green is noticed as a place supported by citizens who had retired from business, or whose affairs permitted them to seek country air; a description which suggests a rustic locality far different from the present East End of London; and indeed this special correspondent adds, "families of substance then preferred to go a further distance from the city." A former minister of "the meeting-house near the Three Cranes," receives a more than ordinarily strange notice. After Mr. Gouge, "a popular preacher and a zealous Calvinist," there came one "who meddled with public affairs, which reaching the Parliament House, he had to be removed;" but before he took his leave, "he fell foul upon divers worthy ministers," and then founded another Church, where "the people were all obliged to stand up while singing psalms; periwigs were discarded, and the men wore whiskers, and a new order passed for the women's garb." This strange person, whose name was Jacob, preached at Turners' Hall, Philpot Lane, where he reflected "publicly on King William, and drolled on the names of many worthy

ministers." A number of other meeting-houses are mentioned, with details of minute descriptions, giving peeps into the state of Nonconformity nowhere else to be found. Two places this informant mentions were of more than ordinary interest. Near Westminster Abbey, Calamy, as we have seen, was pastor of a flourishing Church. The country visitor had no love for him. "He is a good preacher, but a zealous man for the Kirk, and would be more useful if more consistent. He is a great opposer of narrow souls, and wherever his diocese reaches, he encourages persons of latitude enough, and were his schemes generally pursued, the national Church would find greater multitudes of daily converts." Some would say "Quite the contrary;" but at all events there can be no doubt as to the class of Dissenters to which this country critic belonged. He could not but enter the meeting-house in Bury Street, St. Mary Axe, where the Church "continued in a most flourishing condition, and in 1731 was nearly twice as large as in 1695." Watts, the senior pastor, inspired this stranger's admiration. "He is of a sweet, peaceable disposition, and as much as most men follows his Master's example in going about doing good;" (but he has to do with men who trouble him,) "particularly one Mr. Bradbury, a lecturer at Pinners' Hall, who from his own pulpit, and at the Hall, makes it his business to lampoon and satirize the Doctor's performances, and amongst them his psalms and hymns, for which so many Christians and Churches have reason to bless God."

The writer draws up his statistical account with the view of stopping a prevalent rumour, "that this interest is in a very low and declining condition;" yet he acknowledges it was not at the time advancing, as it

had done, and for this he assigns certain reasons. "One is the influence that is produced by the Test Act, by which all persons that enjoy places of profit or trust under the Government, or in particular corporations, are obliged to take the Sacrament in the Church of England ; this has been a snare to many persons among the Dissenters, whereby they have been drawn from occasional to stated communion ; and it has been often seen, that if parents do not, yet the children of such parents quit the Dissenting interest, and this mostly in families of figure and substance. Another cause of the Dissenting interest losing ground, is the manifest growth of error, by which is meant the spreading of Arminianism and Socinianism, which is very often the cause of Deism and Infidelity." But he observes, "the Dissenting ministers of the Independent denomination are almost to a man Calvinists, and on that account are the more united in judgment of any set of Christians in the kingdom ; and were they but as much cemented in affection, and acted with greater concert to serve the real interest of Christianity, much greater services might be expected of them ; were some few of them masters of a little more temper, prudence, and charity, and others of a little more zeal, it would be a pleasing prospect ; but although a perfect harmony and union is very desirable, yet, at present, it is a thing rather to be wished for than expected. There have been," it is added, "at least twenty persons who called themselves Dissenting ministers, who have conformed to the Church of England since the year 1718 ; and if the laity had travelled the same road in an equal proportion, that interest would have received a greater shock."

Three stages are noticeable in the history of Non-

conformist denominations. The first, is when persecution prevails, and the members of a proscribed sect are knit more closely together by the attacks made upon them from without. Zeal is then at a white heat, "the social principle mixes with the flame, and renders it more intense; strong parties are formed, and friends or lovers are not more closely connected than the members of these little communities." The second stage is one of reasoning and examination; opinions are canvassed; those who before testified by patient suffering, now defend themselves by argument; and keen polemical conflicts ensue. There is more of self-assertion, a bolder claim for the enjoyment of social privileges. Critical and ambitious habits unite; and under their influence, much early zeal subsides and expires. In the third stage, people get weary of controversy, for there is less of opposition, and with that there comes spiritless indifference; also a strong temptation to worldly conformity. "A sense of shame," it has been observed, "creeps in upon them when they acknowledge their relation to a disesteemed sect; they therefore endeavour to file off its peculiarities, but in so doing, they destroy its very being. . . . After having betrayed, perhaps, an aversion from having anything in common with the Church, they now affect to come as near it as possible; and, like a little boat that takes a large vessel in tow, the sure consequence is, the being drawn into its vortex."\* So far as inward spiritual strength dried up, and left members of the community open to influences which drew them off in another direction, so far also diminished zeal and activity in the way of gaining fresh adherents would follow as a matter of course; and these circumstances would

\* Mrs. Barbauld's "Works," II. 248.

increase the tide of decline and the advance of decay. Except where the old Puritan fires continued to burn, few accessions would accrue, until the Methodist revival inspired afresh, drooping Churches of the Nonconformist order.

END OF VOL. V.



Date Due





BW5020 S88 1882 v.5  
History of religion in England from the

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00035 6602